



**USAID** | **WEST BANK/GAZA**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# BENEFICIARY SATISFACTION ASSESSMENT

EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE PROJECT (RAFEED)



SEPTEMBER 2005

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Massar Associates under contract to ARD, Inc.

Submitted to:

ARD / RAFEED  
12 LUTHERAN CHURCH STREET  
RAMALLAH, WEST BANK



Submitted by:

MASSAR ASSOCIATES  
P.O. BOX 1218  
RAMALLAH  
[WWW.MASSAR.COM](http://WWW.MASSAR.COM)



In association with:

ALPHA INTERNATIONAL  
AL KARMEL BUILDING,  
IRSAL STREET, RAMALLAH  
[WWW.ALPHA.PS](http://WWW.ALPHA.PS)



# BENEFICIARY SATISFACTION ASSESSMENT

EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE PROJECT (RAFEED)

SEPTEMBER 2005

**DISCLAIMER**

The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	v
SECTION ONE: METHODOLOGY .....	1
SECTION TWO: SURVEYED PROJECTS .....	3
SECTION THREE: DATA FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS .....	10
SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS .....	10
RELEVANCE .....	13
AWARENESS .....	19
VALIDITY OF BENEFICIARY SELECTION .....	20
EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY .....	29
PROGRAM QUALITY AND BENEFICIARY SATISFACTION .....	33
RECOMMENDATIONS .....	42
FINDINGS OF INTERVIEWS WITH NGO PERSONNEL .....	44
FINDINGS OF INTERVIEWS WITH KEY INFORMANTS .....	47
ANNEX A: BENEFICIARY QUESTIONNAIRE .....	49
ANNEX B1: MATRIX OF KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS .....	62
ANNEX B2: KEY INFORMANT QUESTION LISTS .....	65
ANNEX C1: MATRIX OF NGO PERSONNEL INTERVIEWS .....	71
ANNEX C2: NGO PERSONNEL QUESTION LISTS .....	73

# LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Rafeed Projects by Type of Intervention, April 2005 .....	3
Table 2: Matrix of Surveyed Projects.....	4
Table 3: Sample Distribution by Project.....	10
Table 4: Sample Distribution by Intervention and Region .....	10
Table 5: Sample Distribution by Region and Governorate.....	11
Table 6: Sample Distribution by Governorate, Intervention and Region .....	11
Table 7: Age of Respondent by Intervention .....	12
Table 8: Sampled Beneficiaries by Age by Intervention.....	12
Table 9: Main context for receiving assistance vs. Intervention .....	13
Table 10: Region and Gender vs. Main context for receiving assistance .....	13
Table 11: Extent of urgency at time of receiving assistance by Region .....	14
Table 12: Beneficiary's emergency / humanitarian situation caused by conflict.....	14
Table 13: Consequence of emergency / humanitarian situation.....	15
Table 14: Psychological stress by Age and Gender .....	15
Table 15: Beneficiaries' Perceptions of Community Needs by Region.....	16
Table 16: Main context for Rafeed Projects vs. Other Projects .....	18
Table 17: Awareness of Rafeed by Intervention .....	19
Table 18: Awareness of USAID by Intervention .....	19
Table 19: Beneficiaries' Perceptions of they Type of Rafeed Assistance .....	20
Table 20: Number of Family Members by Intervention.....	20
Table 21: Education obtained by Intervention.....	21
Table 22: Occupation by Intervention .....	21
Table 23: Monthly Family Income by Intervention .....	22
Table 24: Family and Income Data Matrix.....	23
Table 25: Method of beneficiary registration for project.....	24
Table 26: Method of beneficiary registration for project by Intervention .....	25
Table 27: Method of Registration vs. Selection Criteria Explained.....	26
Table 28: Selection criteria explained vs. Intervention .....	27
Table 29: Fairness of selection criteria by Region.....	27
Table 30: Intervention vs. Main context for receiving assistance .....	29
Table 31: Outcome of no assistance vs. Region .....	30
Table 32: Extent to which commodity / service helped beneficiary cope by Region.....	31
Table 33: Extent to which assistance helped beneficiary cope by Intervention .....	31
Table 34: Extent to which assistance met community's most urgent need .....	32
Table 35: Problems affecting the delivery of assistance vs. Region .....	33
Table 36: Beneficiary involved in planning and designing project with NGO .....	33
Table 37: Method of Participation by Project.....	34
Table 38: Beneficiary's satisfaction with his/her participation in the project .....	35
Table 39: Problems Encountered by Beneficiaries vs. Type of Intervention.....	36
Table 40: Extent of Satisfaction .....	37
Table 41: Region and Degree of Satisfaction.....	38
Table 42: Satisfaction vs. Intervention .....	39
Table 43: Region and Gender by Satisfaction .....	39
Table 44: Satisfaction by Projects with more than 100 beneficiaries.....	40
Table 45: Reasons for Non-Satisfaction .....	41
Table 46: Beneficiary Recommendations.....	42
Table 47: Beneficiaries' recommendations by Intervention .....	43
Table 48: Perceptions of Rafeed's Operational Systems .....	45
Table 49: Comparison of Rafeed's working systems with other donors.....	45
Table 50: Working with Rafeed and NGO Capacity .....	45
Table 51: NGO Personnel - Recommended programmatic issues.....	46
Table 52: NGO Personnel - Recommended projects and programs.....	46

Table 53: Extent of urgency at time of assistance .....47

Table 54: Extent to which project helped beneficiaries cope.....47

Table 55: Extent of key informants' satisfaction with the project .....48

# INTRODUCTION

The Emergency Assistance Program, locally known as *Rafeed*, is an \$18.2 million initiative of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) that commenced in May 2002, and is set to end in February 2006. ARD, Inc. is the USAID implementation partner for Rafeed.

The objective of Rafeed is to provide a highly targeted, rapidly implementable grants program to address urgent needs of Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza. The essential means of accomplishing this is to utilize local NGOs (of various sizes and capabilities) as the main vehicle for service delivery.

Emphasis is placed on reaching the poorest and most marginalized Palestinians, living in remote areas, in enclaves that experience prolonged closures, and in regions severely impacted by occupation and recurring conflict.

In March 2005, Rafeed commissioned Massar Associates and ALPHA International to undertake a comprehensive review of beneficiaries' satisfaction with the assistance that they had received from Rafeed. The aim of the Beneficiary Satisfaction Assessment (BSA) was to:

- Assess the extent of beneficiary satisfaction with Rafeed's projects, partner NGOs and service delivery methods;
- Identify the relative success of Rafeed's interventions and projects;
- Assess the role of NGOs in delivering services and working with beneficiaries;
- Document and analyze the opinions of key informants (prominent and relevant individuals) on Rafeed's work; and
- Assess the impact of Rafeed's work on its beneficiaries and on Palestinian communities overall.

As of March 2005, Rafeed had 78 projects (valued at \$8,206,097) completed or under implementation. Such projects provide general and emergency humanitarian assistance to needy communities; improve public services and infrastructure primarily in rural localities; and support special-needs groups such as youth, long-term unemployed, and individuals whose homes were damaged or destroyed as a result of occupation. In 38 months of operations, Rafeed had reached more than 900,000 beneficiaries with the provision of emergency and humanitarian assistance. Approximately 60% of assistance resources targeted Gaza.

Projects supported range from emergency food distribution to housing renovations to summer camps for children living in ongoing conflict zones and marginalized communities. Addressing the escalating household economic crisis, Rafeed generated over 157,000 workdays, mostly for local, semi-skilled workers.

The submission of this report marks the successful conclusion of the BSA.

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## INTRODUCTION

Funded by USAID and implemented by ARD, Inc., the Emergency Assistance Program, locally known as *Rafeed*, provides a rapidly implementable grants program to address the urgent needs of Palestinians in West Bank and Gaza, by utilizing local NGOs as the main vehicle for service delivery.

In March 2005, Rafeed commissioned Massar Associates and ALPHA International to undertake a comprehensive review of beneficiaries' satisfaction with the assistance that these beneficiaries had received. Additional interviews were conducted with representatives of the implementing NGO and key informants.<sup>1</sup> The purpose of these additional interviews is to provide a context and/or triangulation for beneficiary response. The key informants' responses are particularly important as they represent a more objective feedback and community context.

Rafeed, Massar and ALPHA designed and tested three information-gathering tools to gather data from beneficiaries, NGO personnel and key informants. A total of 1,125 beneficiaries were interviewed, in addition to 31 NGO personnel and 90 key informants, across 31 Rafeed projects in both Gaza and the West Bank.

## FINDINGS

**The survey findings prove definitively that Rafeed succeeded in targeting Palestinian individuals and communities with real and urgent needs.** More than 90% of interviewed key informants said that the projects met urgent needs for communities as a whole and that the assistance reached the beneficiaries who needed it the most.

The survey concluded that a typical Rafeed beneficiary was a member of a family with only one working person, who earns on average US\$275 per month and is required to support between seven and eight family members. This reflects the difficulty of living conditions for Rafeed's target beneficiaries, who can be characterized as residing in large and poverty-stricken families.

**Rafeed reached Palestinians who were in an ever-deepening crisis with no other support.** 92% of all beneficiaries described their situation as “very urgent” or “urgent” at the time of receiving assistance. More than 90% of NGO personnel and key informants also described the situation of beneficiaries as “very urgent” or “urgent”.

**90% of all beneficiaries indicated that their situation would have worsened had Rafeed not intervened to assist them.** For 77% of beneficiaries, Rafeed was the only organization that reached them.

The two most common consequences for beneficiaries of their emergency situation were psychological stress (highest in the Gaza Strip) and a shortage of basic life-sustaining goods (highest in the West Bank).

---

<sup>1</sup> Rafeed defined key informants as members of the surveyed community with specialized knowledge of the project's context (e.g. community activists, municipal officials or relevant ministry representatives) who were either involved in project planning or were aware of project implementation.

**Prolonged conflict and violence caused the emergency situation for the majority of beneficiaries (73%).** However, there were noteworthy regional and gender differences. In the Gaza Strip, 77% of beneficiaries linked the conflict and violence with their crises - in comparison to the smaller but still significant percentage (58%) in the West Bank that made the same link.

82% of female beneficiaries attributed their emergency situation to the state of conflict, compared to 65% of male beneficiaries. Furthermore, significant gender differences existed in beneficiaries' identification of their most urgent need: 47% of male beneficiaries cited jobs as their most urgent individual need, while 52% of female beneficiaries listed material household needs (food, medicine, clothes and school items). This evidences the fact that male and female beneficiaries were impacted differently by their emergency situations, and had contrasting perceptions on what type of assistance would ameliorate their crisis. Male beneficiaries were more concerned with finding a sustainable source of income for their family, while female beneficiaries were primarily concerned with meeting their families' short-term needs.

**The survey indicates that the breakdown of public services contributed significantly to the humanitarian crisis in the West Bank and Gaza.** 53% of beneficiaries identified the shortage or non-existence of basic public services as the main reason that qualified them for receiving assistance. In comparison, unemployment and poverty were less frequently listed as the main reason for beneficiaries qualifying for assistance (18% and 11% respectively).

Again, these results vary by region and gender. West Bank beneficiaries were primarily affected by the absence or shortage of basic public services (78%) and less affected by unemployment (13%) and poverty (3%). While the public service crisis was also a leading problem for Gaza's beneficiaries (47%), unemployment and poverty were also pressing problems (19% and 14% respectively). Just over half of all male and female beneficiaries agreed on the impact of inadequate basic public services. However, male beneficiaries listed unemployment (23%) as the second reason for qualifying for assistance, while female beneficiaries listed poverty (17%).

Interestingly, few beneficiaries identified Israeli military actions, activities or practices as the reason they qualified for Rafeed assistance. This suggests that, while the vast majority of beneficiaries said that the conflict and violence had caused their emergency situation, they needed Rafeed assistance to cope with the socio-economic consequences of the conflict rather than its events.

**Satisfaction with Rafeed assistance was high amongst everyone interviewed.** The overriding majority of beneficiaries were satisfied with the assistance that they received: 90% of beneficiaries indicated that they were "satisfied to an extent," "satisfied" and "highly satisfied" with the Rafeed project through which they received assistance.

NGO personnel and key informants believed that Rafeed projects were timely, well targeted, relevant and effective. All NGO personnel interviewed believed that Rafeed was a good response mechanism for emergency situations: 72% of the NGO personnel rated Rafeed as a better response mechanism than other donors.

96% of key informants were satisfied with the Rafeed project, particularly with the project results and impact. Reasons for satisfaction included: project achieved sustainable results; assistance targeted beneficiaries with high levels of psychological stress; project targeted children; Rafeed supported agricultural projects; and communities were better organized as a result of Rafeed's project.

**Beneficiaries were more satisfied with Rafeed than other service providers.** From the 24% of beneficiaries who indicated that they had also received services from other providers, 56% indicated that they were more or much more satisfied with the Rafeed service. 15% indicated that they were equally satisfied with services provided by Rafeed and other providers. **75% of beneficiaries indicated the main impediment to their satisfaction was the continuation of the conflict.**

**Rafeed projects successfully matched the needs of Palestinian individuals and communities.** A strong correlation exists between beneficiaries' needs and the type of project from which they benefited,

indicating without a doubt that Rafeed succeeded in accurately identifying the most urgent needs of the community at the time of planning the delivery of assistance with NGOs. 89% of key informants believed that the assistance was directly relevant to beneficiaries' humanitarian needs.

The survey found that, at an individual level, food, clothes, medicine and school items was the most urgent individual needs for 21% of beneficiaries at the time of receiving assistance, followed by jobs (19%), public infrastructure and services such as schools, hospitals, and childcare centers (14%), water tanks (12%), financial support (10%) and agricultural assistance and marketing services (9%).

**Rafeed's assistance helped Palestinians cope with the situation in which they found themselves at the time of receiving assistance** - irrespective of whether the immediate cause of their emergency situation was occupation, or poverty or long-term unemployment.

97% of sampled beneficiaries indicated that the assistance that they received was "very helpful" or "helpful" or "helpful to a certain extent." 52% of West Bank beneficiaries indicated that the assistance was "very helpful" in helping them cope, compared to 19% in the Gaza Strip.

97% of key informants and 90% of NGO personnel agreed that the projects helped the beneficiaries to cope with their situation, while 95% of NGO personnel said that the commodities and services reached the people who needed them the most at the time of delivery.

Beneficiaries indicated that the assistance helped them by:

- Providing essential public services, increased public sanitation and improved environmental cleanliness (49%);
- Improving social and psychological situation and access to better child-care services (25%);
- Improving economic situation, increased income and jobs (21%); and
- Providing food, shelter and medicine (4%).

**Satisfaction was lowest overall with the amount of assistance provided through Rafeed projects.**

Of the 9% of beneficiaries who indicated that factors existed that impacted their satisfaction with assistance received, 73% cited insufficient amount and length of assistance. Similarly, the lowest level of satisfaction amongst NGO personnel and key informants was with the adequacy of assistance. This frustration with the amount of assistance provided was also expressed in the programmatic recommendations made by beneficiaries and key informants for increased project duration and scope. While there could be many reasons for this focus on adequacy of assistance, it may be explained by the fact that Rafeed was designed to respond rapidly to multiple and evolving emergency needs, which precludes large amounts of sustained assistance.

**Levels of awareness of Rafeed and USAID were relatively high** given the emergency nature of Rafeed projects and the multiple tiers between USAID and Rafeed and the final beneficiaries. 31% of beneficiaries correctly identified Rafeed as the agency funding the NGO. Awareness of Rafeed was highest in youth support projects (64%) and job creation projects (46%) and least in general construction projects (11%).

24% of beneficiaries correctly identified USAID as the donor; 73% responded that they did not know, while 3% incorrectly identified alternative donors. Awareness of USAID was highest in general construction projects (73%), followed by youth support (32%) and least in job creation (3%).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Recognition of donor support tends to be low amongst Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza. A recent survey by Alpha International (March 2005) found that no donor was recognized for its financial support of Palestinians by more than 30% of respondents. The survey found that USAID was the second most recognized donor (at 14.2%, following France at 27.2%). Interestingly, in contrast to this survey's findings that recognition of USAID was higher in the Gaza Strip, the Rafeed BSA found that 61% of Rafeed beneficiaries in the West Bank correctly identified USAID as the donor, compared to 17% in Gaza.

**Beneficiaries were satisfied with Rafeed's selection of NGO partners:** 84% of beneficiaries indicated that they did not encounter any (significant) problems with the implementation of projects. However, problems did exist in the interaction of NGOs with beneficiaries, for which the lowest levels of beneficiary satisfaction were recorded. Only 4% of beneficiaries were involved in planning the project with the NGO. In contrast, half the NGO personnel interviewed indicated that beneficiaries were involved in planning and designing projects. This contradiction can be attributed to NGOs exaggerating the extent to which beneficiaries were integrated in the planning and needs identification phase for Rafeed-funded projects.

**Beneficiaries were least satisfied with their interaction with NGOs.** The lowest levels of satisfaction amongst beneficiaries (less than 63%) were noted for (a) NGO interface with beneficiaries and (b) NGO's responsiveness to beneficiaries' opinions.

**Rafeed developed efficient and effective working systems.** 95% of beneficiaries judged selection criteria for projects from which they benefited to have been fair and transparent. Beneficiaries were also highly satisfied (80% - 90%) with (a) timeliness of project / service, (b) timeliness of service / commodity delivery, (c) method of service / commodity delivery and (d) physical state of commodity. Levels of beneficiary satisfaction ranged from 64% - 79% for (a) method of commodity distribution, (b) suitability of service / commodity and (c) adequacy of service / commodity.

**Rafeed functioned better than other donors,** according to NGO personnel's ratings of its working systems. In general, NGOs preferred all of Rafeed's working systems to those of other donors. The majority of NGO personnel agreed that Rafeed's proposal appraisal and project selection system was based on clear and transparent criteria.

**Working with Rafeed helped NGOs build programmatic and reporting capacity,** even though capacity-building was not a part of Rafeed's mandate. An average of 79% of NGO personnel agreed that their organizational capacity had been built in some way. (More than 50% of NGO personnel agreed strongly or totally that capacity building had occurred.) 60% of interviewed NGO personnel acknowledged that special forms and procedures were developed specifically for working and reporting on the Rafeed-funded project. 30% agreed that prior knowledge of USAID regulations assisted them in designing the project, while a similar proportion disapproved of the need to sign anti-terrorism certification.

# SECTION ONE:

## METHODOLOGY

The methodology outlined below details the sequence of working processes that was accomplished in order to successfully complete the survey.

### Design Information Gathering Tools (IGT)

Utilizing a participatory approach including personnel from Rafeed, Massar and ALPHA, the project team proceeded to design three types of IGTs:

- a. Questionnaires for semi-structured interviews with beneficiaries;
- b. Question Lists for NGO Interviews; and
- c. Question Lists for Key Informant Interviews.

Themes embedded into the IGTs' questions include:

- The validity of beneficiary selection;
- Relevancy and priority of projects with respect to urgent community needs;
- Timeliness of projects and service delivery;
- Quality of service delivery, quality and quantity of project deliverables; and
- Relevancy of Rafeed mechanisms to urgent needs and vulnerable communities.

Please See *Annex A*, *Annex B2*, and *Annex C2* to review the Beneficiary Questionnaire, Key Informant Question List and NGO Personnel Question List respectively.

### Specify Survey Sample

The project team proceeded to select a representative sample of Rafeed projects to be included in the survey – beneficiaries, NGO personnel and key informants would be interviewed from within these selected projects in order to obtain the required data for the assessment.

In ensuring that the selected sample would be representative of Rafeed's work, the project team abided by the following parameters in sample design:

- The distribution of Rafeed's projects by intervention-types;
- The gender distribution of Rafeed beneficiaries; and
- The distribution of Rafeed beneficiaries between West Bank and Gaza.

From within each selected project, the project team identified the primary interview target (beneficiary). Rafeed and partner NGOs provided names and contact details for NGO personnel and key informants that needed to be interviewed per project.

The roster of selected projects is detailed in *Section Two: Surveyed Projects*.

### Pilot Survey

In order to test the developed IGTs and identify problematic or unclear questions, ALPHA International recruited and trained fieldworkers to undertake pilot interviews with 108 beneficiaries, 7 NGO personnel and 12 key informants across 7 Rafeed projects in both the West Bank and Gaza.

### Finalize IGTs and Survey Sample

Based on fieldworkers' feedback, minor changes were adapted to Pilot Survey IGTs in order to generate the final questionnaire and question lists. Rafeed personnel updated beneficiary lists and verified project output data. ALPHA recruited and trained fieldworkers in two training workshops in Ramallah and Gaza.

### Full Survey

ALPHA International interviewed 1,125 beneficiaries, 31 NGO personnel and 90 key informants across the West Bank and Gaza.

### Data Entry and Findings

Interviews with NGO personnel and key informants were transcribed and submitted to Rafeed. Data from each of the three target groups was coded and entered into three specially designed SPSS databases that mirrored the tools used in the survey.

Quality control variables were used to remove unclear data. Of a total of 1,125 interviews with beneficiaries, 1,102 were used for the purpose of data analysis, as 23 deficient questionnaires were discounted from the analysis.

### Data Analysis and Final Reporting

In the final stage of the project, Massar Associates analyzed the data and documented the results (tools, data and analysis), as presented in this report.

# SECTION TWO: SURVEYED PROJECTS

At the time of designing the survey (April 2005), Rafeed had 68 projects completed or under implementation, distributed across seven types of interventions, as outlined below:

TABLE 1: RAFEED PROJECTS BY TYPE OF INTERVENTION, APRIL 2005			
Intervention	Definition	# of Projects	# of Beneficiaries
Humanitarian Services	Provision of services to those in need	11	472,181
Construction	Construction and repair of public assets / infrastructure	16	143,967
Humanitarian Commodities	Distribution of goods to those in need	14	76,048
Small Scale Infrastructure	Construction, repair and renovation of private assets	14	29,561
Emergency Response	Rapid response to urgent and critical needs	3	25,191
Job Creation	Generating working days for unemployed adults	3	21,179
Youth Activities	Provision of activities/services for youth (aged 5 – 18)	7	7,577

In order to generate reliable *country-wide* and *intervention-specific* data, the survey aimed to interview no less than 120 beneficiary per intervention and at least 1,100 beneficiaries in total from across a minimum of 30 projects.

The tables below list and detail the projects that were selected and surveyed per intervention.

TABLE 2: MATRIX OF SURVEYED PROJECTS

PIN (Project Identification Number)	Intervention	Project Description	Implementing NGO	Estimated Total # of Beneficiaries	Surveyed Project Location	Survey Primary Target Groups (Beneficiaries)	Number of Interviewed Beneficiaries
178WN04	Construction	Constructing a Water Reservoir	Rafeed Direct Assistance	2,360	Jenin: Anza	Households in community / mothers	68
001GS02	Construction	Renovation and Rehabilitation of Parks	The Free Thinking and Culture Assoc.	22,528	Khan Yunis	Households in community / mothers	20
032WS03	Construction	Construction of a Culvert, Widening and Paving of School Street	Idna Welfare Society for Higher Education	12,578	Hebron: Idna	Residents aged 16+, 50% M/F, students from school on street	18
272GN03	Construction	Repair/Renovation of Schools	Association of Educational Enrichment and Creative Thinking	7,777	North Gaza: Jabalya	Teachers, students aged 16+ at school	11
230GN03I	Construction	Rehabilitation of Water/Sewerage Infrastructure	Palestinian Environmental Friends Association	6,088	North Gaza: Jabalya	Citizens in location aged 16+, 50% M/F	9
112WS03	Construction	Supply Suba Village with High Voltage Electricity Feed line	Idna Charitable Society	2,058	Hebron: Idna, Suba	Citizens in location (Suba) aged 16+, 50% M/F	4
003WN03	Construction	Developing Parks and Recreational Areas	Arab Center for Agricultural Development	20,858	Jenin: Al Zababdeh	Households in community: Mothers/female caregivers	1
							131

<b>PIN (Project Identification Number)</b>	<b>Intervention</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Implementing NGO</b>	<b>Estimated Total # of Beneficiaries</b>	<b>Surveyed Project Location</b>	<b>Survey Primary Target Groups (Beneficiaries)</b>	<b>Number of Interviewed Beneficiaries</b>
<b>012WN02</b>	Small Scale Infrastructure	Digging Potable Water Cisterns	Palestinian Hydrology Group	10,800	Nablus: Asera Al Qibliya, Iraq Boreen, Boreen, Tel	Workers employed by project, mothers/ fathers in homes	47
<b>209GN03I</b>	Small Scale Infrastructure	Repair of Houses	Jabalia Rehabilitation Society	3,496	North Gaza: Jabalya, Beit Hanun	Workers employed by project, mothers/ fathers in homes	17
<b>023GS02</b>	Small Scale Infrastructure	House Rehabilitation for Poor Families	Development & Improvement Environment Society	3,276	Khan Yunis	Workers employed by project, mothers/ fathers in homes	16
<b>088GS04</b>	Small Scale Infrastructure	Agricultural Revitalization in the Conflict Zones of Southern Gaza	Greenhouses Farmers' Society	2,849	Khan Yunis	Farmers helped by project; workers employed by project	14
<b>101GN02</b>	Small Scale Infrastructure	Poultry and Rabbit Pens for Women with Limited Income	Beit Lahiya Development Association (BLDA)	1,694	North Gaza: Jabalya; Beit Lahiya	Workers employed by project, mothers/ fathers in homes	11
<b>172GN02I</b>	Small Scale Infrastructure	Assist Poor Families in Rehabilitating their Houses	Association of Engineers - Northern Gaza Branch	2,163	North Gaza: Jabalya; Beit Lahiya	Workers employed by project, mothers/ fathers	10

						in homes	
002WN02	Small Scale Infrastructure	Rehabilitate the Houses of Very Poor Families	Community Services Center, Al Najah University	864	Nablus	Mothers/ fathers in homes	4
							119

PIN (Project Identification Number)	Intervention	Project Description	Implementing NGO	Estimated Total # of Beneficiaries	Surveyed Project Location	Survey Primary Target Groups (Beneficiaries)	Number of Interviewed Beneficiaries
201GN02	Job Creation	Create Jobs for Unemployed and Needy People	Green Peace Society	20,042	Gaza: Al Mughraqa (Abu Middein)	Workers employed by project	120
							120

PIN (Project Identification Number)	Intervention	Project Description	Implementing NGO	Estimated Total # of Beneficiaries	Surveyed Project Location	Survey Primary Target Groups (Beneficiaries)	Number of Interviewed Beneficiaries
101GS04	Youth Support Activities	Recreational Summer Camps for the Children living in the Conflict Zones in Southern Gaza	Bunian Association for Training, Evaluation and Community Studies	1,810	Khan Yunis (Al Qarara) and Rafah (Rafah Camp)	Beneficiary households: mothers only	50
249GN04	Youth Support Activities	Recreational Summer Camps for the Children living in the Conflict Zones of Northern Gaza	PCHRD Company for Human Resource Development	1,102	Gaza: Al Mughraqa	Beneficiary households: mothers only	29

011GS02	Youth Support Activities	Creation of Job Opportunities in the Field of Community Intervention for a Group of Unemployed Graduates	Bunian Association for Training, Evaluation and Community Studies	1,797	Khan Yunis	Graduates; mothers of graduates	25
							104

PIN (Project Identification Number)	Intervention	Project Description	Implementing NGO	Estimated Total # of Beneficiaries	Surveyed Project Location	Survey Primary Target Groups (Beneficiaries)	Number of Interviewed Beneficiaries
002GS02	Humanitarian Commodities	Psychological and Educational Support for Kindergarten Children	El Hanan Benevolent Assoc. for Mother and Child	14,434	Khan Yunis	Beneficiary households: 70% mothers, 30% fathers	52
265GN04	Humanitarian Commodities	Emergency Food for Recurrent Areas of Conflict in Northern Gaza	Nour El Ma'rifa Charitable Society	8,505	Deir el Balah; An Nuseirat Camp	Beneficiary households: 70% mothers, 30% fathers	30
105GS04	Humanitarian Commodities	Emergency Food for Recurrent Areas of Conflict in Southern Gaza	Al-Awdah Charitable Association	5,705	Khan Yunis: Isan Al Kabeerah	Beneficiary households: 70% mothers, 30% fathers	20
001WS02	Humanitarian Commodities	Educational Material Needs	Annour Youth Institution	13,112	Bethlehem: Husan	Beneficiary households: 70%	16

		for PNA Students in the Primary Stage				mothers, 30% fathers	
<b>034WC04</b>	Humanitarian Commodities	Hygiene and Infant Aid to 27 Villages in Western Ramallah Area	Association of Women Committees for Social Work (AWCSW)	6,044	Ramallah: Na`aleen	Beneficiary households: 70% mothers, 30% fathers	14
							<b>132</b>

<b>PIN (Project Identification Number)</b>	<b>Intervention</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Implementing NGO</b>	<b>Estimated Total # of Beneficiaries</b>	<b>Surveyed Project Location</b>	<b>Survey Primary Target Groups (Beneficiaries)</b>	<b>Number of Interviewed Beneficiaries</b>
<b>089GS03</b>	Emergency Support	Emergency Water Supply to Displaced and other Needy Families in Rafah	Al-Amal Rehabilitation Society for the Disabled	7,000	Rafah: Rafah Camp	Beneficiary households: 50% mothers/fathers	46
<b>090GS04</b>	Emergency Support	Urgent Food Baskets for Displaced and Sieged Rafah Citizens	Al-Awdah Charitable Association	7,077	Rafah	Beneficiary households: mothers only	37
<b>088GS03</b>	Emergency Support	Emergency Food Assistance to Displaced and other Needy Families in Rafah	Al-Amal Rehabilitation Society for the Disabled	4,221	Rafah: Rafah Camp	Beneficiary households: mothers only	36
							<b>119</b>

PIN (Project Identification Number)	Intervention	Project Description	Implementing NGO	Estimated Total # of Beneficiaries	Surveyed Project Location	Survey Primary Target Groups (Beneficiaries)	Number of Interviewed Beneficiaries
221GN03I	Humanitarian Services	Street Clean Up, Sidewalk Railing Installation, and Public Garden Rehabilitation	PCHRD Company for Human Resource Development	24,234	North Gaza: Beit Hanun	Street residents, community members	175
006GS02	Humanitarian Services	Fencing Agricultural Pools	Bunat Al-Mustaqbal Association	13,000	Rafah	Farmers, community members	95
110GN02	Humanitarian Services	Improve the Quality of Drinking Water in Government Elementary Schools, and Raise Environmental and Health Awareness	Community Service & Continuing Education Center (CSCEC) - The Islamic University in Gaza	74,117	Gaza City	Mothers, Teachers	53
008GS02	Humanitarian Services	Improvement of Potable Water Quality and Enhancement of Environmental Awareness in Rafah and Khan Younis Schools	Palestinian Environmental Friends Association	30,348	Rafah	Mothers, Teachers	29
170WN04	Humanitarian Services	Continuous Operation and Maintenance of Ya'bad Existing Pump Station	Rafeed Direct Assistance	12,096	Jenin: Ya'bad	Citizens in location aged 16+, 50% M, 50% F	25
							377

# SECTION THREE: DATA FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

## SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS

TABLE 3: SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION BY PROJECT

Number of beneficiaries per project	GC		SI		JC		YS		HC		HS		ER		Overall
	Project	#	Project	#	Project	#	Project	#	Project	#	Project	#	Project	#	1102 beneficiaries over 31 projects
	178WN04	68	012WN02	47	201GN02	120	101GS04	50	002GS02	52	221GN03I	175	089GS03	46	
	001GS02	20	209GN03I	17			249GN04	29	265GN04	30	006GS02	95	090GS04	37	
	032WS03	18	023GS02	16			011GS02	25	105GS04	20	110GN02	53	088GS03	36	
	272GN03	11	088GS04	14					001WS02	16	008GS02	29			
	230GN03I	9	101GN02	11					034WC04	14	170WN04	25			
	112WS03	4	172GN02I	10											
	003WN03	1	002WN02	4											
Totals	7	131	7	119	1	120	3	104	5	132	5	377	3	119	

As indicated in the table above, a total of 1,102 beneficiaries were interviewed, across 31 projects funded by Rafeed.

TABLE 4: SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION BY INTERVENTION AND REGION

Intervention	WB (#)	G (#)	Total (#)	WB (%)	G (%)	Total (%)
GC	91	40	131	8%	4%	12%
SI	51	68	119	5%	6%	11%
JC	0	120	120	0%	11%	11%
YS	0	104	104	0%	9%	9%
HC	30	102	132	3%	9%	12%
HS	25	352	377	2%	32%	34%
ER	0	119	119	0%	11%	11%
Overall	197	905	1102	18%	82%	100%

The total beneficiary sample comprised 905 beneficiaries in Gaza and 197 in the West Bank. Total number of interviewed beneficiaries per intervention ranged

from 9% to 12% of the total sample, with the exception of HS – interviewed beneficiaries in this sample comprised 34% of the total sample.

TABLE 5: SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION BY REGION AND GOVERNORATE			
Region	Governorate	#	%
West Bank	Jenin	94	9%
	Nablus	51	5%
	Ramallah	14	1%
	Bethlehem	16	1%
	Hebron	22	2%
Gaza Strip	North Gaza	224	20%
	Gaza City	92	8%
	Deir Al Balah	140	13%
	Khan Yunis	164	15%
	Rafah	285	26%
Overall:		1102	100%

Interviewed beneficiaries resided in 5 governorates in each of the West Bank and Gaza, including Rafah (26% of sample), North Gaza (20%), Khan Yunis (15%), Deir Al Balah (13%), Jenin (9%), Gaza City (8%), Nablus (5%), Hebron (2%) and Bethlehem and Ramallah (1% each.) This distribution is generally representative of Rafeed's operations, as occupation realities necessitated increased programmatic involvement in Gaza relative to the West Bank.

TABLE 6: SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION BY GOVERNORATE, INTERVENTION AND REGION																	
Region	Governorate	GC		SI		JC		YS		HC		HS		ER		Overall	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
West Bank	Jenin	69	53%									25	7%			94	9%
	Nablus			51	43%											51	5%
	Ramallah									14	11%					14	1%
	Bethlehem									16	12%					16	1%
	Hebron	22	17%													22	2%
Gaza Strip	North Gaza	11	8%	38	32%							175	46%			224	20%
	Gaza City					10	8%	29	28%			53	14%			92	8%
	Deir Al Balah					110	92%			30	23%					140	13%
	Khan Yunis	20	15%	30	25%			42	40%	72	55%					164	15%
	Rafah	9	7%					33	32%			124	33%	119	100%	285	26%
Total		131	100%	119	100%	120	100%	104	100%	132	100%	377	100%	119	100%	1102	100%

The majority of sampled beneficiaries receiving GC-type assistance reside in the Jenin governorate, with a smaller number in Khan Yunis, Hebron, North Gaza and Rafah. Those receiving SI-type assistance reside in Khan Yunis, Nablus and North Gaza. The overwhelming majority of sampled JC beneficiaries live in Deir Al Balah, similarly sampled YS beneficiaries reside exclusively in Gaza Strip governorates. More than half of sampled HC beneficiaries live in Khan Yunis, in addition to Bethlehem, Deir Al Balah and Ramallah; the majority of HS sampled beneficiaries reside in North Gaza, in addition to Gaza City, Jenin, and Rafah. Sampled ER beneficiaries reside exclusively in Rafah.

**TABLE 7: AGE OF RESPONDENT BY INTERVENTION**

	GC		SI		JC		YS		HC		HS		ER		Overall	
Number of family members	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
16 thru 24	38	29%	10	8%	8	7%	13	13%	4	3%	63	17%	8	7%	144	13%
25 thru 34	15	11%	40	34%	30	25%	40	38%	38	29%	109	29%	43	36%	315	29%
35 thru 44	16	12%	37	31%	36	30%	29	28%	48	36%	87	23%	29	24%	282	26%
45 thru 54	6	5%	24	20%	23	19%	21	20%	32	24%	55	15%	22	18%	183	17%
55 thru 64	2	2%	5	4%	16	13%	1	1%	7	5%	26	7%	10	8%	67	6%
65 thru Highest	54	41%	3	3%	7	6%			3	2%	37	10%	7	6%	111	10%
Total	131	100%	119	100%	120	100%	104	100%	132	100%	377	100%	119	100%	1102	100%

The majority of sampled beneficiaries are aged 25 to 34 (55%) – young adults aged less than 25 comprised 13% of all interviewees, while the elderly comprised 10% of the total sample.

**TABLE 8: SAMPLED BENEFICIARIES BY AGE BY INTERVENTION**

	GC		SI		JC		YS		HC		HS		ER		Overall	
Gender	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Male	70	53%	45	38%	71	59%	21	20%	45	34%	262	69%	42	35%	556	50%
Female	61	47%	74	62%	49	41%	83	80%	87	66%	115	31%	77	65%	546	50%
Total	131	100%	119	100%	120	100%	104	100%	132	100%	377	100%	119	100%	1102	100%

Half the interviewed beneficiaries were female, and half male. Male respondents outnumbered their female counterparts in the GC, JC and HS intervention areas, while female beneficiaries comprised the majority of respondents for the SI, HC and ER interventions. It is important to note that, in the YS category, direct beneficiaries were often less than 15 years old: as a result, mothers were selected as interview respondents, even though they were indirect beneficiaries.

## RELEVANCE

**Q: Why did beneficiaries qualify for receiving assistance?**

**TABLE 9: MAIN CONTEXT FOR RECEIVING ASSISTANCE VS. INTERVENTION**

	GC		SI		JC		YS		HC		HA		ER		Overall	
Context as specified by respondent	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Israeli activities, actions and practices	9	7%	14	12%					2	2%			52	46%	77	7%
Poverty			39	33%	1	1%	1	1%	82	63%	3	1%	7	6%	133	12%
Public institutions destroyed / damaged	4	3%	9	8%							8	2%	6	5%	27	2%
Shortage of basic life-sustaining goods (food)			2	2%					4	3%	6	2%	31	27%	43	4%
Non-existence / shortage of basic public services	118	90%	33	28%			74	71%	20	15%	310	83%	17	15%	572	53%
Unemployment			19	16%	111	99%	29	28%	13	10%	19	5%			191	18%
Lack of basic social services			1	1%					10	8%	29	8%			40	4%
Total	131	100%	117	100%	112	100%	104	100%	131	100%	375	100%	113	100%	1083	100%

Most beneficiaries (53%) identified the shortage or non-existence of basic public services as the main context that qualified them for receiving assistance; 18% of beneficiaries identified unemployment; and a further 12% identified poverty.

**TABLE 10: REGION AND GENDER VS. MAIN CONTEXT FOR RECEIVING ASSISTANCE**

Context as specified by respondent	T		West Bank		Gaza Strip		Male		Female	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Israeli activities, actions and practices	77		2	1%	75	8%	30	6%	47	9%
Poverty	133		5	3%	128	14%	42	8%	91	17%
Public institutions destroyed / damaged	27				27	3%	19	4%	8	1%
Shortage of basic life-sustaining goods	43		1	1%	42	5%	14	3%	29	5%
Non-existence / shortage of basic public services	572		149	78%	423	47%	297	55%	275	51%
Unemployment	191		25	13%	166	19%	125	23%	66	12%
Lack of basic social services	40		10	5%	30	3%	13	2%	27	5%
Total	1083		192	100%	891	100%	540	100%	543	100%

78% of beneficiaries in the West Bank identified the non-existence or shortage of basic public services as the main context for receiving assistance, compared to 47% in Gaza; as well as 55% of male beneficiaries and 51% of female beneficiaries.

**Q: To what extent do beneficiaries consider their situation to have been 'urgent' at the time of receiving assistance?**

TABLE 11: EXTENT OF URGENCY AT TIME OF RECEIVING ASSISTANCE BY REGION						
	West Bank		Gaza Strip		Overall	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Very urgent	135	69%	501	55%	636	58%
Urgent	43	22%	332	37%	375	34%
Urgent to a certain extent	10	5%	51	6%	61	6%
Not urgent	3	2%	16	2%	19	2%
Not urgent at all	0	0%	5	1%	5	1%
No answer	6	3%	0	0%	6	1%
Total	197	100%	905	100%	1102	100%

92% of all beneficiaries described their situation as very urgent or urgent at the time of receiving assistance. The sum of "very urgent" and "urgent" responses was consistently more than 90% of all beneficiaries when disaggregated by age, region, or type of assistance received.

**Q: To what extent was the urgency caused by the Israeli occupation and related features (violence, curfews, closures etc.)**

TABLE 12: BENEFICIARY'S EMERGENCY / HUMANITARIAN SITUATION CAUSED BY CONFLICT	#	%
Yes	804	73%
No	293	27%
Total	1097	100%

73% of all beneficiaries consider that their emergency situation was caused by the conflict and violence, comprising 77% of all beneficiaries in Gaza and 58% of those in the West Bank. 82% of all female beneficiaries indicated that their emergency situation was caused by conflict, in addition to 65% of male beneficiaries. A substantial number of male beneficiaries indicated that unemployment was in fact the primary cause of the emergency situation that they found themselves in at the time of receiving assistance.

**Q: What were the consequences of the urgent (emergency / humanitarian) situation on beneficiaries?**

946 beneficiaries indicated that psychological stress was the primary consequence of the emergency or humanitarian situation in which they found themselves at the time of receiving assistance. Additional consequences cited, and their frequency, are listed below:

TABLE 13: CONSEQUENCE OF EMERGENCY / HUMANITARIAN SITUATION	Total	WB	GS
	#	#	#
Psychological stress	946	109	837
Shortage of basic life-sustaining goods	580	39	541
No income – cannot afford basic goods and services	428	34	394
Immobility – lack of access to basic public services	397	129	268
Neighborhood / community infrastructure destroyed	365	3	362
Private property destroyed	344	4	340
Long term unemployment	340	44	296
Injuries / fatal accidents to relatives	337	8	329
Lack of medical products	334	32	302
Cannot access jobs or services	224	29	195
Eviction	210	5	205
Continued isolation – could not be reached	183	2	181

In Gaza, the majority of beneficiaries cited psychological stress as the primary consequence of the emergency or humanitarian situation in which they found themselves at the time of receiving assistance; in West Bank, most indicated the lack of access to basic social and public services.

TABLE 14: PSYCHOLOGICAL STRESS BY AGE AND GENDER						
Age Group	Male		Female		Overall	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
16 thru 24	77	84%	44	79%	121	82%
25 thru 34	125	87%	152	85%	277	86%
35 thru 44	119	93%	140	89%	259	91%
45 thru 54	79	86%	90	98%	169	92%
55 thru 64	45	92%	18	95%	63	93%
65 thru Highest	30	55%	27	42%	57	48%
Total	475		471		946	

Rates of psychological stress were significantly high across all groups except those aged more than 65. 98% of 45 to 54 year-old female beneficiaries identified psychological stress as the primary consequence of the emergency situation they found themselves in; the ratio is consistently more than 80% for all age and gender groups except men and women over 65.

**Q: What did beneficiaries identify as being their community's most urgent needs at the time of receiving assistance?**

Beneficiaries identified the following as their community's most urgent needs at the time of receiving assistance:

- Public infrastructure and services such as schools, hospitals, childcare centers, educational facilities (63%);
- Jobs and income generation projects, especially for women (59%);
- Providing food and clothes packages (21%);
- Medical aid and building clinics (17%);
- Educational infrastructure: Schools, childcare centers, education and computer centers (15%);
- Supporting cultural and youth activities (12%);
- Providing, restoring and furnishing houses (10%);
- Providing care to those with special needs (10%);
- Providing social and psychological security (10%); and
- Support agricultural projects and planting land (8%).

TABLE 15: BENEFICIARIES' PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNITY NEEDS BY REGION	Jenin	Nablus	Ramallah	Bethlehem	Hebron	West Bank Overall	North Gaza	Gaza	Deir Al Balah	Khan Yunis	Rafah	Gaza Overall	Overall
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Jobs and income generation projects, especially for women	51%	43%	64%	25%		42%	71%	47%	78%	60%	55%	63%	59%
Public infrastructure and services	28%	88%	36%	19%	95%	51%	50%	98%	67%	69%	63%	65%	63%
Providing food and clothes packages	28%	22%		88%		26%	12%	18%	13%	23%	30%	20%	21%
Support agricultural projects and planting land		2%		6%		1%	16%	1%	2%	4%	15%	10%	8%
Medical aid and building clinics	2%	4%			14%	4%	37%	36%	16%	4%	14%	20%	17%
Providing, restoring and furnishing houses		2%				1%	6%	2%	4%	4%	27%	11%	10%
Educational infrastructure	9%	2%	7%	25%	32%	11%	23%	11%	22%	15%	9%	16%	15%
Supporting cultural and youth activities	11%					5%	15%	15%	12%	20%	8%	13%	12%
Providing care to those with special needs			21%			2%	3%				0%	1%	1%
Social and psychological security	84%	2%	36%			42%	1%	7%	1%	2%	4%	3%	10%

51% of West Bank beneficiaries identified public infrastructure and services; while 42% indicated jobs and incomes and social and psychological security were amongst their communities' most urgent needs. The majority of Gaza beneficiaries identified the needs for jobs and improved public infrastructure as their communities' primary needs. The need for public infrastructure was also markedly high in Nablus (88%) and Hebron (95%), as was the need for security in Jenin (84%). Only 3% of Gaza beneficiaries identified social and psychological security as amongst their communities' most urgent needs.

**Q: What did beneficiaries identify as being their most urgent individual needs at the time of receiving assistance?**

Beneficiaries identified the following as their most urgent individual needs at the time of receiving assistance:

- Food, clothes, medicine, school items (21%);
- Jobs (19%);
- Public infrastructure and services such as schools, hospitals and childcare centers (14%);
- Water tanks (12%);
- Financial support (10%);
- Agricultural assistance and marketing services (9%);
- Clean parks, providing summer and youth camps (8%); and
- No urgent needs (2%).

Male beneficiaries identified the following as their most urgent individual needs at the time of receiving assistance:

- Jobs (47%);
- Food, clothes, medicine, school items (35%);
- Agricultural assistance and marketing services (33%);
- Public infrastructure and services such as schools, hospitals and childcare centers (25%);
- Financial support (21%);
- Water tanks (15%); and
- No urgent needs (1%).

Female beneficiaries identified the following as their most urgent individual needs at the time of receiving assistance:

- Food, clothes, medicine, school items (52%);
- Water tanks (33%);
- Public infrastructure and services such as schools, hospitals, and childcare centers (32%);
- Parks, providing summer and youth camps (23%);
- Financial support (18%); and
- No urgent needs (3%).

**Q: How similar was the assistance provided by Rafeed to that provided by other providers?**

**TABLE 16: MAIN CONTEXT FOR RAFEED PROJECTS VS. OTHER PROJECTS**

Main context For receiving Rafeed assistance:		Main context for receiving 1st additional service							Total
		Israeli activities, actions, and practices	Poverty	Public institutions destroyed / damaged	Shortage of basic life-sustaining goods (food)	Non existence/ shortage of basic public services	Unemployment	Lack of basic social services	
Israeli activities, actions and practices	#	15	1	0	1	0	2	0	19
	%	79%	5%	0%	5%	0%	11%	0%	100%
Poverty	#	0	40	1	3	0	0	3	47
	%	0%	85%	2%	6%	0%	0%	6%	100%
Public institutions destroyed / damaged	#	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	6
	%	0%	17%	33%	17%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Shortage of Basic Life-sustaining goods (food)	#	0	10	1	10	0	0	0	21
	%	0%	48%	4%	48%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Non existence/ Shortage of basic public services	#	7	33	5	17	49	11	4	126
	%	6%	26%	4%	14%	39%	9%	3%	100%
Unemployment	#	0	5	1	1	1	10	0	18
	%	0%	28%	6%	6%	6%	56%	0%	100%
Lack of basic social services	#	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	6
	%	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	100%
Total	#	22	94	10	33	52	23	9	243
	%	9%	39%	4%	14%	21%	10%	4%	100%

Of the 23% of beneficiaries who received assistance from Rafeed and additional service providers:

- 79% of those who indicated that they had received assistance from Rafeed due to Israeli actions, received assistance for the same reason from other providers;
- 85% of those who indicated that they had received assistance from Rafeed due to poverty, received assistance for the same reason from other providers;
- 33% of those who indicated that they had received assistance from Rafeed due to destroyed public services, received assistance for the same reason from other providers;
- 48% of those who indicated that they had received assistance from Rafeed due to the shortage of life-sustaining goods, received assistance for the same reason from other providers;

- 39% of those who indicated that they had received assistance from Rafeed due to the shortage of public services, received assistance for the same reason from other providers;
- 56% of those who indicated that they had received assistance from Rafeed due to unemployment, received assistance for the same reason from other providers; and
- 33% of those who indicated that they had received assistance from Rafeed due to the lack of basic social services, received assistance for the same reason from other providers.

## AWARENESS

### Q: Are beneficiaries aware of Rafeed's existence?

Respondent beneficiaries received assistance from 100 organizations, 40 of which worked with Rafeed in delivering projects, directly or indirectly. 31% of beneficiaries correctly identified Rafeed as the funding agency. 61% specified that they did not know who funded the program, while the remainder either specified that to the best of their knowledge the NGO that had the funded the program, or incorrectly identified an alternative funding source. 38% of beneficiaries in Gaza correctly identified Rafeed, compared with 0.5% in the West Bank. Within Gaza, awareness of Rafeed was markedly higher in Gaza City, Khan Yunis and Deir Al Balah than Rafah and North Gaza. Overall, 38% of male beneficiaries correctly identified Rafeed, compared to 25% of female beneficiaries.

**TABLE 17: AWARENESS OF RAFEED BY INTERVENTION**

	GC	SI	JC	YS	HC	HS	ER	Overall
Correctly identified Rafeed	15	39	56	67	30	99	39	345
% of total number of beneficiaries in intervention	11%	33%	47%	64%	23%	26%	33%	31%

Awareness of Rafeed was highest in YS (64%), followed by JC (46%). GC was the lowest category (11%).

### Q: Are beneficiaries aware of USAID's existence?

24% of beneficiaries correctly identified USAID as the donor; 73% responded that they did not know, while 3% incorrectly identified alternative donors. 61% of beneficiaries in the West Bank correctly identified USAID, compared to 17% in Gaza. 27% of male beneficiaries correctly identified USAID, compared to 22% of female beneficiaries.

**TABLE 18: AWARENESS OF USAID BY INTERVENTION**

	GC	SI	JC	YS	HC	HS	ER	Overall
Correctly identified USAID	95	21	3	33	19	70	25	266
% of total number of beneficiaries in intervention	73%	18%	3%	32%	15%	19%	21%	24%

Awareness of USAID was highest in GC (73%), followed by YS (32%). JC was the lowest category (3%).

**Q: How do beneficiaries characterize the type of assistance that they received from Rafeed?**

**TABLE 19: BENEFICIARIES' PERCEPTIONS OF THEY TYPE OF RAFEED ASSISTANCE**

		GC	SI	JC	YS	HC	HS	ER	NA	Overall
Number of beneficiaries receiving this assistance based on Rafeed's classifications	#	131	119	120	104	132	377	119	0	1102
	%	12%	11%	11%	9%	12%	34%	11%	0%	100%
Number of beneficiaries who perceive that they received this form of assistance from Rafeed	#	167	95	187	0	251	96	291	15	1102
	%	15%	9%	17%	0%	23%	9%	26%	1%	100%

34% of beneficiaries in the survey benefited from HS projects, with 9-12% distribution of beneficiaries across the other six categories. However, 26% of beneficiaries characterized Rafeed's projects as ER – or those responding to an emergency situation, as opposed to HS (projects aiming to meet humanitarian needs irrespective of whether these needs were founded in 'urgent' circumstances.) This evidences that beneficiaries perceive Rafeed as an emergency response organization more than a humanitarian and relief organization.

## VALIDITY OF BENEFICIARY SELECTION

**Q: Did the project reach vulnerable and impoverished beneficiaries?**

**TABLE 20: NUMBER OF FAMILY MEMBERS BY INTERVENTION**

Live in family with:	GC		SI		JC		YS		HC		HS		ER		Overall	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1 to 4 members	29	22%	18	15%	8	7%	12	12%	13	10%	55	15%	24	20%	159	14%
5 to 8 members	63	48%	57	48%	62	52%	39	38%	71	54%	161	43%	58	49%	511	46%
9 to 12 members	36	27%	34	29%	41	34%	47	45%	41	31%	125	33%	28	24%	352	32%
13 to 16 members	3	2%	8	7%	6	5%	6	6%	7	5%	24	6%	5	4%	59	5%
17 + members			2	2%	3	3%					12	3%	4	3%	21	2%
Total	131	100%	119	100%	120	100%	104	100%	132	100%	377	100%	119	100%	1102	100%

The majority of Rafeed beneficiaries (46%) live in families that comprise five to eight individuals, while 32% are members of families with nine to twelve members. Generally, in providing assistance to beneficiaries, Rafeed reached mostly families that are larger than the national average of 6.4 members per family (PCBS, 1997 Census), across all interventions. Given the strong negative correlation between number of family members and real family income, Rafeed succeeded in assisting individuals that are members of relatively larger families with smaller real income.

**TABLE 21: EDUCATION OBTAINED BY INTERVENTION**

	GC		SI		JC		YS		HC		HS		ER		Overall	
Education obtained	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Can't read and write	3	2%	11	9%	23	19%	6	6%	13	10%	15	4%	6	5%	77	7%
Can read and write	3	2%	8	7%	4	3%	2	2%	8	6%	15	4%	7	6%	47	4%
Primary school (G1-6)	8	6%	27	23%	26	22%	12	12%	15	11%	37	10%	10	8%	135	12%
Mid-school (G7-9)	43	33%	40	34%	33	28%	23	22%	42	32%	75	20%	37	31%	293	27%
Secondary school (G10-12)	41	31%	19	16%	27	23%	24	23%	42	32%	127	34%	29	24%	309	28%
Diploma	11	8%	9	8%	1	1%	3	3%	4	3%	25	7%	15	13%	68	6%
Bachelor, and More	22	17%	5	4%	6	5%	34	33%	8	6%	83	22%	15	13%	173	16%
Total	131	100%	119	100%	120	100%	104	100%	132	100%	377	100%	119	100%	1102	100%

Only 22% of beneficiaries had higher education credentials, while 50% of beneficiaries did not complete more than elementary school. Secondary school graduates comprised 28% of sampled beneficiaries. 33% beneficiaries with higher educational credentials benefited from YS assistance, which specifically targeted young, unemployed, university graduates. The findings prove that Rafeed assisted mostly beneficiaries that are semi-skilled or unskilled with little education (78%).

**TABLE 22: OCCUPATION BY INTERVENTION**

	GC		SI		JC		YS		HC		HS		ER		Overall	
Employment Status	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Unemployed	84	64%	85	71%	113	94%	88	85%	111	84%	159	42%	91	76%	731	66%
Employed	47	36%	34	29%	7	6%	16	15%	21	16%	218	58%	28	24%	371	34%
Total	131	100%	119	100%	120	100%	104	100%	132	100%	377	100%	119	100%	1102	100%

66% of sampled beneficiaries are unemployed – more than half of beneficiaries are unemployed across all intervention areas, save HC. The need to provide assistance to these individuals and their families is self-evident.

**TABLE 23: MONTHLY FAMILY INCOME BY INTERVENTION**

	GC		SI		JC		YS		HC		HS		ER		Overall	
Household Monthly Revenue	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Less than 1,000 NIS	34	26%	80	67%	118	98%	75	72%	100	76%	176	47%	74	62%	657	60%
1,001 to 2,000 NIS	56	43%	35	29%	2	2%	21	20%	30	23%	127	34%	33	28%	304	28%
2,001 to 3,000 NIS	22	17%	4	3%	0	0%	5	5%	0	0%	41	11%	10	8%	82	7%
3,001 to 4,000 NIS	14	11%	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	2	2%	19	5%	2	2%	39	4%
4,001 to 5,000 NIS	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	8	2%	0	0%	11	1%
More than 5,001 NIS	3	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	2%	0	0%	9	1%
Total	131	100%	119	100%	120	100%	104	100%	132	100%	377	100%	119	100%	1102	100%

88% of sampled beneficiaries live in households that survive less than 2,000 shekels per month. It is important to note that the given the high rates of unemployment, it is clear that most beneficiaries are surviving on income gained by fellow family members, and not through direct employment.

TABLE 24: FAMILY AND INCOME DATA MATRIX

Intervention	# of family members	# of families	Mean # of members	Mean # contributing to family monthly revenue	# of working-age members (15 - 64 yrs)	# of dependant members (< 15 / > 64 yrs)	Mean monthly family revenue (NIS)
GC	1 to 4	29	3.07	1	2.21	0.86	1430.34
	5 to 8	63	6.79	1.21	4.14	2.65	1911.9
	9 to 12	36	9.94	1.75	5.75	4.19	2295.83
	13 to 16	3	13.33	1.33	6.67	6.67	2000
	17+	0					
	Total	131	6.98	1.31	4.21	2.77	1912.82
SI	1 to 4	18	3	0.61	1.72	1.28	624.61
	5 to 8	57	6.74	0.93	2.98	3.75	977.53
	9 to 12	34	10.09	1.03	4.79	5.29	829.71
	13 to 16	8	13.63	1.13	7.75	5.88	1312.5
	17+	2	20	1	11	9	700
	Total	119	7.82	0.92	3.76	4.05	899.76
JC	1 to 4	8	3.13	0.63	2.38	0.75	512.5
	5 to 8	62	6.6	0.71	3.42	3.18	504.84
	9 to 12	41	10.15	0.76	5.17	4.98	580.49
	13 to 16	6	13.67	0.83	6.17	7.5	733.33
	17+	3	20.33	1	6.33	14	900
	Total	120	8.28	0.73	4.16	4.12	552.5
YS	1 to 4	12	3.17	0.92	2.25	0.92	866.67
	5 to 8	39	7	1.05	3.74	3.26	1071.79
	9 to 12	47	9.91	1.09	5.51	4.4	1054.26
	13 to 16	6	13.33	1	7.17	6.17	833.33
	17+	0					
	Total	104	8.24	1.05	4.57	3.67	1026.44
HC	1 to 4	13	3.15	0.31	1.92	1.23	392.31
	5 to 8	71	6.79	0.77	3.08	3.7	873.94
	9 to 12	41	10.1	1	5.17	4.93	870.73
	13 to 16	7	14.14	0.57	6.57	7.57	757.14
	17+	0					
	Total	132	7.85	0.79	3.8	4.05	819.32
HS	1 to 4	55	3.22	1.09	2.22	1	1481.82
	5 to 8	161	6.71	1.32	3.57	3.14	1669.57
	9 to 12	125	10.1	1.31	5.43	4.67	1386.4
	13 to 16	24	14.08	1.62	8.33	5.75	1695.83
	17+	12	19.33	3.17	10.83	8.5	2683.33
	Total	377	8.2	1.36	4.52	3.67	1582.23
ER	1 to 4	24	2.96	0.75	2	0.96	891.25
	5 to 8	58	6.45	1.1	3.79	2.66	1180.17
	9 to 12	28	9.93	1.11	5.32	4.61	1167.86
	13 to 16	5	15	0.6	5.8	9.2	1060
	17+	4	20.25	1.5	12.5	7.75	1300
	Total	119	7.39	1.03	4.17	3.22	1117.98
Overall	1 to 4	159	3.11	0.87	2.11	1	1101.97
	5 to 8	511	6.71	1.07	3.53	3.19	1269.22
	9 to 12	352	10.05	1.18	5.34	4.71	1209.97
	13 to 16	59	13.95	1.19	7.41	6.54	1308.47
	17+	21	19.71	2.33	10.52	9.19	1976.19
	Total	1102	7.89	1.11	4.24	3.65	1241.74

On average, Rafeed beneficiaries live in families with 7.9 members, of whom 3.65 (almost half) are direct dependants aged less than 15 or more than 64. 1.1 persons contribute to family income, earning on average 1,241 shekels per month. In other words, Rafeed beneficiaries tend to be members of families with only one working person, who earns on average US\$ 275 per month, and who is required to support between seven and eight family members. This reflects the difficulty of living conditions for Rafeed's target group, which can be characterized as residing in large and poverty-stricken families.

89% of interviewed beneficiaries agreed that Rafeed's assistance reached those who needed it the most. 7% indicated that they could not specify with certainty that it did reach those with the most acute needs since they had benefited from ER-type assistance and were not in a position to judge the extent of assistance in such interventions. The remaining 3% who indicated that the assistance had not, in their opinions, reached those who were most in need cited the following reasons:

- The quantity of the service was insufficient;
- There was favoritism in the selection of beneficiaries;
- The assistance did not meet people's most acute needs;
- In order to benefit from the service, a certain nominal amount of money had to be paid by the beneficiary, and those who were most in need of assistance did not have the means to pay; and
- Beneficiaries were not able to reach or access the provided assistance or services.

**Q: How did beneficiaries come get registered with the NGO?**

<b>TABLE 25: METHOD OF BENEFICIARY REGISTRATION FOR PROJECT</b>	<b>Total #</b>	<b>Total %</b>
The NGO approached him/her	223	20%
S/he approached the NGO	269	24%
Others approached the NGO on his/her behalf	139	13%
Other beneficiary recommended him/her	13	1%
Local institution recommended him/her	65	6%
Local persona recommended him/her	16	1%
There was no need for registration	315	29%
S/he I was informed by other beneficiaries	54	5%
No response	8	1%
Total	1102	100%

20% of beneficiaries indicated that they were approached by the NGO, while 24% indicated that they had approached the NGO. 29% indicated that there was no formal registration for the project, the majority of those having benefited from GC or ER assistance, as evidenced by the table below.

**TABLE 26: METHOD OF BENEFICIARY REGISTRATION FOR PROJECT BY INTERVENTION**

	GC		SI		JC		YS		HC		HS		ER		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
The NGO approached him/her	1	1%	17	14%	14	12%	20	19%	52	39%	76	20%	43	36%	223	20%
S/he approached the NGO	0	0%	42	35%	83	69%	56	54%	14	11%	45	12%	29	24%	269	24%
Others approached the NGO on his/her behalf	17	13%	7	6%	15	13%	14	14%	14	11%	71	19%	1	1%	139	13%
Other beneficiary recommended him/her	0	0%	5	4%	6	5%	0	0%	1	1%	1	0%	0	0%	13	1%
Local institution recommended him/her	0	0%	36	30%	0	0%	1	1%	26	20%	2	1%	0	0%	65	6%
Local persona recommended him/her	0	0%	3	3%	0	0%	1	1%	11	8%	0	0%	1	1%	16	2%
There was no need for registration	109	83%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	14	11%	145	39%	45	38%	315	29%
S/he was informed by other beneficiaries	3	2%	7	6%	0	0%	11	11%	0	0%	33	9%	0	0%	54	5%
No response	1	1%	2	2%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	4	1%	0	0%	8	1%
Total	131	100%	119	100%	120	100%	104	100%	132	100%	377	100%	119	100%	1102	100%

In the GC category, all projects did not require formal registration; in some projects, the recommendation of beneficiaries by third parties was accommodated. In the SI intervention, selection focused primarily on the NGO approaching beneficiaries or beneficiaries approaching the NGO; similarly, recommendations by third parties were occasionally accommodated. In the only surveyed JC project, 201GN02 (Gaza / Job Creation, 120 beneficiaries), 83 of 120 surveyed beneficiaries indicated that they were approached by the NGO. In the YS category, selection focused primarily on the NGO approaching beneficiaries or beneficiaries approaching the NGO for all three sampled projects. In the HC intervention, beneficiary selection was not uniform across sampled projects and included no need for registration, recommendations by third parties, beneficiaries approaching the NGO and vice versa. In HS project 221GN03I (North Gaza / Street Repair, 175 beneficiaries), beneficiaries indicated that there was no need to register; in other projects, beneficiaries were similarly not required to register, or were alerted by beneficiaries and then approached the NGO, or were approached directly by the NGO. Finally, in the ER category, beneficiaries either approached, or were approached by, the NGO, or there was no need to register.

**Q: Were the selection criteria explained to the beneficiary?**

TABLE 27: METHOD OF REGISTRATION VS. SELECTION CRITERIA EXPLAINED				
Method of beneficiary selection	NGO explained criteria to beneficiary			
		Yes	No	Total
The NGO approached him/her	#	56	167	223
	%	25	75	100
S/he approached the NGO	#	95	174	269
	%	35	65	100
Others approached the NGO on his/her behalf	#	12	127	139
	%	9	91	100
Other beneficiary recommended him/her	#	1	12	13
	%	8	92	100
Local institution recommended him/her	#	38	27	65
	%	58	42	100
Local person recommended him/her	#	10	6	16
	%	63	38	100
There was no need for registration	#	28	287	315
	%	9	91	100
S/he was informed by other beneficiaries	#	11	43	54
	%	20	80	100
No response	#	0	8	8
	%	0	100	100
Total	#	251	851	1102
	%	23	77	100

NGOs explained the selection criteria to only 25% of beneficiaries that they approached for inclusion in the project. The incidence of NGOs explaining selection criteria to beneficiaries was highest when a fellow community member recommended the prospective beneficiary to the NGO.

TABLE 28: SELECTION CRITERIA EXPLAINED VS. INTERVENTION																
NGO explained selection criteria to beneficiary	GC		SI		JC		YS		HC		HS		ER		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	30	23%	81	68%	9	8%	38	37%	22	17%	58	15%	13	11%	251	23%
No	101	77%	38	32%	111	92%	66	63%	110	83%	319	85%	106	89%	851	77%
Total	131	100%	119	100%	120	100%	104	100%	132	100%	377	100%	119	100%	1102	100%

The incidence of NGOs explaining the beneficiary selection criteria was highest in the SI intervention-type (68%); by contrast, 92% of beneficiaries receiving JC assistance did not have selection criteria explained to them.

Beneficiaries provided examples of the selection criteria of which they were informed by NGOs. These included (in order of frequency):

- Project focuses on what is most destroyed and damaged or most needed;
- No availability of water or water system, no access to water;
- Beneficiary farmers must own and maintain their water pools, in salty lands;
- Beneficiaries must be aged between six and fourteen;
- Beneficiaries must have experience in working with children; and
- Beneficiaries must be new university graduates.

In JC project 201GN02 (Gaza / Job Creation, 120 beneficiaries) and HS project 221GN03I (North Gaza / Street Repair, 175 beneficiaries) selection criteria were explained to less than half of sampled beneficiaries.

**Q: Did beneficiaries judge selection criteria to be clear and transparent?**

Table 29: FAIRNESS OF SELECTION CRITERIA BY REGION	West Bank		Gaza Strip		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Beneficiary selection criteria were fair and transparent	164	83%	887	98%	1051	95%
Beneficiary selection criteria were NOT fair and transparent	12	6%	15	2%	27	3%
Don't know	21	11%	3	0%	24	2%
Total	197	100%	905	100%	1102	100%

Overall, 95% of beneficiaries judged selection criteria to be fair and transparent. 3% of beneficiaries agreed with the statement that the selection criteria were not

fair, citing the following reasons:

- Favoritism in beneficiary selection;
- Did not know criteria, beneficiaries did not need to be registered;
- Poor families needed to pay to obtain service, unwilling to financially contribute; and
- Businessmen were beneficiaries and controlled the project.

In each of the surveyed projects, at least 90% of beneficiaries felt that the selection criteria were clear and transparent.

**Q: Did beneficiaries feel that the project helped others with similar, or more acute, needs than themselves? If yes, how? If no, why?**

51% of beneficiaries indicated that, in their opinion, the project from which they benefited helped others with similar and more acute need to them, while a further 18% indicated that, in their opinion, the project helped others with similar needs only, by:

- Helping employees, children, big families, special-needs groups;
- Providing jobs for the unemployed;
- Providing clean drinking water and basic needs at a low cost;
- Helped cleanliness of environment, and SI to deprived people; and
- Providing public and social services for all people.

Reasons cited for why beneficiaries thought that the project did not help others with similar needs (1.5%) or more acute needs (3.5%) included:

- The project did not cover all people in need
- Favoritism and no willingness to pay by those in need
- Some beneficiaries were not in needy or were businessmen who were controlling the project

The majority of beneficiaries were undecided in both JC project 201GN02 (Gaza / Job Creation, 120 beneficiaries) and HS project 221GN03I (North Gaza / Street Repair, 175 beneficiaries).

## EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY

**Q: Did Rafeed successfully match between beneficiary's needs and type of assistance?**

TABLE 30: INTERVENTION VS. MAIN CONTEXT FOR RECEIVING ASSISTANCE									
Context as specified by respondent		GC	SI	JC	YS	HC	HS	ER	Overall
Israeli activities, actions and practices	#	9	14	-	-	2	-	52	77
	%	12%	18%	-	-	3%	-	68%	100%
Poverty	#	-	39	1	1	82	3	7	133
	%	-	29%	1%	1%	62%	2%	5%	100%
Public institutions destroyed / damaged	#	4	9	-	-	-	8	6	27
	%	15%	33%	-	-	-	30%	22%	100%
Shortage of basic life-sustaining goods	#	-	2	-	-	4	6	31	43
	%	-	5%	-	-	9%	14%	72%	100%
Non-existence / shortage of basic public services	#	118	33	-	74	20	310	17	572
	%	21%	6%	-	13%	3%	54%	3%	100%
Unemployment	#	-	19	111	29	13	19	-	191
	%	-	10%	58%	15%	7%	10%	-	100%
Lack of basic social services	#	-	1	-	-	10	29	-	40
	%	-	2%	-	-	25%	73%	-	100%

The above table evidences that Rafeed succeeded in providing assistance to beneficiaries that directly matched their primary needs: 70% of those that identified Israeli actions and the shortage of basic life-sustaining goods as the main context for needing assistance were provided with ER assistance. Furthermore:

- 54% of beneficiaries that identified the non-existence / shortage of basic public services as the main context for needing assistance received HS;
- 73% of beneficiaries that identified the lack of basic social services as the main context for needing assistance received HS; while 25% received HC;
- 58% of beneficiaries that identified unemployment as the main context for needing assistance received JC; and
- 62% of beneficiaries that identified poverty as the main context for needing assistance received HC; a further 29% received SI.

A strong correlation exists between beneficiaries' needs and the type of project from which they benefited, indicating without a doubt that Rafeed succeeded in accurately identifying the most urgent needs of the community at the time of planning the delivery of assistance with NGOs:

- 76% of GC-type beneficiaries indicated that their most urgent need was the better and more accessible public infrastructure and services;
- 50% of SI-type beneficiaries indicated that their most urgent need was the availability of water in their homes or farms;
- 83% for JC-type beneficiaries indicated that their most urgent need was jobs;

- 73% of YS-type beneficiaries indicated that their most urgent need was the lack of services and entertainment activities for them and their children, such as the availability of parks, clubs, and camps;
- 71% of HC-type beneficiaries indicated that their primary need at the time of receiving assistance was food, clothing, medicine, and school items;
- 59% of HS-type beneficiaries indicated that their primary need at the time of receiving assistance was agricultural service and marketing; and
- 83% of ER-type beneficiaries indicated that their primary need at the time of receiving assistance was food, clothing and medicine.

**Q: What would have happened to beneficiaries if Rafeed had not helped them?**

TABLE 31: OUTCOME OF NO ASSISTANCE VS. REGION						
Without assistance, beneficiary's situation would have been:	West Bank		Gaza Strip		Overall	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Worse	155	79%	841	93%	996	90%
No change	42	21%	57	6%	99	9%
Better	0	0%	7	1%	7	1%
Total	197	100%	905	100%	1102	100%

90% of all beneficiaries indicated that their situation would have worsened had Rafeed not intervened to assist them. Gaza beneficiaries specified that the symptoms of not receiving the assistance would have been (1) continued economic hardship and a lack of jobs, (2) the spread of disease and deteriorating health conditions and (3) increased psychological stress and suffering and an overall lack of security. West Bank beneficiaries indicated that the main consequence of not receiving assistance would have been the continued lack of basic life-sustaining goods, and the increased effort and cost required to obtain them.

**Q: Did Rafeed's assistance help beneficiaries cope? Did beneficiaries find the assistance helpful? In yes, how? In no, why?**

97% of sampled beneficiaries indicated that the assistance that they received was "very helpful" or "helpful" or "helpful to a certain extent." 52% of West Bank beneficiaries indicated that the assistance was "very helpful" in helping them cope, compared to 19% in the Gaza Strip.

**TABLE 32: EXTENT TO WHICH COMMODITY / SERVICE HELPED BENEFICIARY COPE BY REGION**

Extent to which commodity helped:	West Bank		Gaza Strip		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Very helpful	102	52%	175	19%	277	25%
Helpful	51	26%	438	48%	489	44%
Helpful to a certain extent	29	15%	270	30%	299	27%
Not helpful	8	4%	14	2%	22	2%
Not helpful at all	6	3%	7	1%	13	1%
No answer	1	1%	1	0%	2	0%
Total	197	100%	905	100%	1102	100%

**TABLE 33: EXTENT TO WHICH ASSISTANCE HELPED BENEFICIARY COPE BY INTERVENTION**

Extent to which commodity helped:	GC		SI		JC		YS		HC		HS		ER		Overall	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Very Helpful	77	59%	36	30%	20	17%	15	14%	33	25%	82	22%	14	12%	277	25%
Helpful	28	21%	32	27%	34	28%	76	73%	68	52%	174	46%	77	65%	489	44%
Helpful to a certain extent	18	14%	48	40%	64	53%	13	13%	22	17%	106	28%	28	24%	299	27%
Not helpful	8	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	5%	8	2%	0	0%	22	2%
Not helpful at all	0	0%	2	2%	2	2%	0	0%	3	2%	6	2%	0	0%	13	1%
No answer	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	2	0%
Total	131	100%	119	100%	120	100%	104	100%	132	100%	377	100%	119	100%	1102	100%

59% of beneficiaries in the GC category described the assistance that they received as 'very helpful.' More than half of the beneficiaries in the YS, HC and ER intervention areas described the assistance as 'helpful.' More than half the beneficiaries in the JC intervention area described the service as 'helpful.' In the SI intervention area, 40% of beneficiaries identified the assistance as "helpful to a certain extent."

3% of sampled beneficiaries indicated that they found the assistance to be "not helpful" or "not helpful at all." Reasons cited included (in order of frequency):

- Insufficient services and the existence of a more important need;
- Bad planning and a lack of maintenance post implementation;
- The existence of other more effective alternative forms of assistance;
- The assistance was out of context, given their needs; and

- There was no follow-up or continued maintenance of the service or facility that Rafeed provided.

Beneficiaries indicated that the assistance helped them by:

- Providing essential public services, increased public sanitation and improved environmental cleanliness (49%);
- Improved social and psychological situation and access to better child-care services (25%);
- Better economic situation, increased income and jobs (21%); and
- Providing food, shelter and medicine (4%).

**Q: Did the assistance provided by Rafeed meet communities' most urgent needs?**

TABLE 34: EXTENT TO WHICH ASSISTANCE MET COMMUNITY'S MOST URGENT NEED						
	West Bank		Gaza Strip		Total	
Assistance met community's most urgent needs	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	171	87%	839	92%	1010	91%
No	19	10%	33	4%	52	5%
I don't know	7	3%	33	4%	40	4%
Total	197	100%	905	100%	1102	100%

92% of beneficiaries said that the Rafeed projects met their community's most urgent needs. Of the 5% who indicated otherwise, the following reasons were cited:

- The service is not sufficient to meet peoples' needs;
- The project failed to solve problems;
- More important assistance was required; and
- Bad planning and a lack of maintenance post implementation.

**Q: Did Rafeed reach beneficiaries who had no one else to assist them?**

23% of beneficiaries who received assistance from Rafeed also received assistance from additional service providers. 77% of beneficiaries did not receive assistance from any other project or organization – Rafeed was the only organization that reached them. Of those 23%, 19% received assistance and service similar to those provided by Rafeed, and 4% received assistance dissimilar to that provided by Rafeed. Dissimilar assistance included:

- Promoting animal farming;
- Distributing livestock;
- Marketing goods produced by rural women;
- Training programs for farmers;

- Build offices for local council;
- Providing agriculture supplies; and
- Building irrigation networks.

**Q: Were there impediments that prevented beneficiaries from benefiting from the Rafeed Project? If yes, what were they?**

TABLE 35: PROBLEMS AFFECTING THE DELIVERY OF ASSISTANCE VS. REGION	West Bank		Gaza Strip		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
There were problems affecting the delivery of the service	15	8%	19	2%	34	3%
There were no problems affecting the delivery of the service	180	92%	886	98%	1066	97%
Total	195	100%	905	100%	1100	100%

97% of beneficiaries indicated that they experienced no impediments in the delivery of the service. Of the 3% who indicated that problems did exist, the following reasons were cited:

- Israeli closures and measures, violence and conflict meant that the service was inaccessible;
- No available water; water too expensive;
- Services unsustainable, not provided for sufficient period of time;
- Difficult to access services; and
- Problems regarding implementation.

## PROGRAM QUALITY AND BENEFICIARY SATISFACTION

**Q: To what extent were beneficiaries involved in planning the project with the NGO?**

TABLE 36: BENEFICIARY INVOLVED IN PLANNING AND DESIGNING PROJECT WITH NGO	Region					
	West Bank		Gaza Strip		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	24	12%	15	2%	39	4%
No, the NGO didn't ask me to be involved	170	87%	890	98%	1060	96%
The NGO asked me to be involved but I chose not to	2	1%	0	0%	2	0%
Total	196	100%	905	100%	1101	100%

Only 4% of beneficiaries were involved in planning the project with the NGO. Types of involvement (in order of frequency)

- Workshop;
- Public gathering;
- Visit by NGO to beneficiary's home or neighborhood;
- Questionnaire distributed by NGOs; and
- Small group discussion.

**TABLE 37: METHOD OF PARTICIPATION BY PROJECT**

	Project	Method of Participation (A beneficiary could have participated through more than 1 method)					Beneficiaries:	
		Workshop	Public gathering	Small group discussion	Visit by NGO	Questionnaire	# who participated	Total #
GC	032WS03	3	5	11	4	8	18	18
	112WS03		1	2			3	4
	178WN04		1	1	1		2	68
	272GN03			1	1	1	3	11
SI	002WN02			3	4		4	4
	023GS02		1	1	1	1	4	16
	088GS04	2	1	2	1	2	5	14
	209GN03I	1	2	2	1	2	6	17
HS	006GS02	4	5	4	4	4	17	95
	110GN02	2		1	1	2	6	53
ER	089GS03		2	2	2	2	8	46

The projects in which *some* beneficiaries indicated that they *had* participated in planning and designing the initiative were from the GC intervention area (4 projects), SI (4 projects), HS (2 projects) and ER (1 project). However, in *none* of the intervention areas does the proportion of beneficiaries who participated in planning exceed 5% of the total number of beneficiaries for that area.

**Q: To what extent were beneficiaries satisfied with their participation in the project?**

TABLE 38: BENEFICIARY'S SATISFACTION WITH HIS/HER PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT	West Bank		Gaza Strip		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	22	92%	15	100%	37	95%
No	2	8%	0	0%	2	5%
Total	24	100%	15	100%	39	100%

Of the 4% who did participate, 95% indicated that they were satisfied with their participation.

84% of beneficiaries did not encounter any (significant) problems with the implementation of projects from which they benefited, comprising 76% of GC, 61% of SI, 98 of JC, 75% of YS, 99% of HC, 84% of HS and 94% of ER. There is no link between the intensity of conflict and problems with service delivery, as evidenced by the ER figure.

16% indicated that they did experience problems with the project, citing the following examples (in order of frequency):

- Irrelevant location and timing; no follow-up, and delayed delivery;
- Project not functional, water polluted and service suspended;
- Insufficient service given beneficiaries needs and number of people in need; and
- Lack of maintenance and sustainability of the project.

Additional minor reasons that were cited included: service / product specifications and conditions of poor quality; lack of security and closures; and a lack of awareness and cooperation amongst beneficiaries.

The distribution of problem across intervention-types is tabulated below:

**TABLE 39: PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED BY BENEFICIARIES VS. TYPE OF INTERVENTION**

	Insufficient service given beneficiaries needs and number of people in need	Lack of maintenance and sustainability of the project	Paid service meant those that who were most in need were excluded	Project not functional, water polluted and service suspended	Irrelevant location and timing; no follow-up, and delayed delivery	Service / product specifications and condition of poor quality	Lack of security and closures	Lack of awareness and cooperation amongst beneficiaries
GC		Y		Y	Y			Y
SI			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
JC					Y			Y
YS	Y		Y		Y		Y	
HC					Y			
HS	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y

- *Y indicates that at least 1 beneficiary indicated that s/he encountered one of the problems cited above.*

**Q: To what extent were beneficiaries satisfied with the Rafeed project overall, and with select features of project operations?**

**TABLE 40: EXTENT OF SATISFACTION**

	Not Satisfied at all (A)	Not Satisfied (B)	Satisfied to an Extent (C)	Satisfied (D)	Highly Satisfied (E)	No Answer	Overall (C+D+E)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Timeliness of project / service	0	3	9	60	25	3	90
Timeliness of service / commodity delivery	0	3	9	58	26	3	89
Method of service / commodity delivery	0	2	8	61	22	7	87
Method of commodity distribution	1	4	14	53	19	9	79
Suitability of service / commodity	1	7	30	38	24	1	77
Adequacy of service / commodity	2	17	32	31	17	0	64
Physical state of commodity	1	4	16	57	20	1	85
NGO's responsiveness to beneficiary's opinions	3	5	14	26	11	40	44
NGO interface with beneficiary	3	5	15	27	11	38	46
Please rank your overall satisfaction with the project	1	2	13	58	25	1	90

Calculation of overall = satisfied to an extent / 2 + satisfied + highly satisfied

Beneficiaries recorded high levels of satisfaction (80% - 90%) with the following themes in projects:

- Timeliness of project / service;
- Timeliness of service / commodity delivery;
- Method of service / commodity delivery; and
- Physical state of commodity.

Beneficiaries recorded high levels of satisfaction with advanced satisfaction (64% - 79%) with the following themes:

- Method of commodity distribution;
- Suitability of service / commodity; and
- Adequacy of service / commodity.

Beneficiaries recorded low levels of satisfaction (less than 63%) with the following themes (most likely as a result of the NGO not integrating the beneficiaries in project planning):

- NGO interface with beneficiary; and
- NGO's responsiveness to beneficiary's opinions.

**90% of beneficiaries indicated that they were "satisfied to an extent," "satisfied" and "highly satisfied" with the Rafeed project through which they received assistance.**

TABLE 41: REGION AND DEGREE OF SATISFACTION		Not Satisfied at all	Not Satisfied	Satisfied to an Extent	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	No Answer
Region	Theme	%	%	%	%	%	%
West Bank	Timeliness of project / service		3%	8%	50%	34%	6%
	Timeliness of service / commodity delivery	1%	5%	8%	42%	40%	5%
	Method of service / commodity delivery	1%	2%	5%	52%	37%	4%
	Method of commodity distribution	3%	5%	4%	42%	32%	15%
	Suitability of service / commodity	1%	4%	3%	32%	59%	2%
	Adequacy of service / commodity	8%	18%	12%	22%	39%	1%
	Physical state of commodity	1%	4%	5%	49%	37%	4%
	NGO's responsiveness to beneficiary's opinions	2%	5%	6%	18%	19%	50%
	NGO interface with beneficiary	1%	3%	6%	19%	19%	51%
	Overall satisfaction with the project from start to end	2%	5%	10%	38%	43%	2%
Gaza Strip	Timeliness of project / service	0%	2%	9%	63%	23%	2%
	Timeliness of service / commodity delivery	0%	3%	10%	61%	23%	3%
	Method of service / commodity delivery	0%	2%	9%	62%	19%	8%
	Method of commodity distribution	0%	4%	16%	56%	16%	8%
	Suitability of service / commodity	1%	7%	37%	39%	16%	1%
	Adequacy of service / commodity	1%	17%	37%	33%	12%	0%
	Physical state of commodity	1%	4%	19%	58%	17%	1%
	NGO's responsiveness to beneficiary's opinions	4%	5%	16%	28%	9%	38%
	NGO interface with beneficiary	4%	6%	16%	29%	10%	35%
	Overall satisfaction with the project from start to end	0%	2%	14%	63%	21%	0%

The only significant difference between the West Bank and Gaza is in the "suitability of service / commodity" theme. In the West Bank, 92% indicated that they were satisfied to an extent or more, compared to 73% in Gaza.

**TABLE 42: SATISFACTION VS. INTERVENTION**

% of beneficiaries who were "satisfied to an extent" + "satisfied" + "highly satisfied"	GC	SI	JC	YS	HA	HS	ER	Overall
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Timeliness of project / service	88	81	95	97	94	86	94	90
Timeliness of service / commodity delivery	88	81	92	97	94	84	95	89
Method of service / commodity delivery	92	84	85	93	98	79	94	87
Physical state of commodity	87	82	77	81	92	86	89	85
Method of commodity distribution	76	75	78	84	95	73	86	79
Suitability of service / commodity	88	82	55	69	84	77	78	77
Adequacy of service / commodity	85	39	50	63	76	62	76	64
NGO interface with beneficiary	27	75	25	66	66	39	41	46
NGO's responsiveness to beneficiary's opinions	30	60	26	66	63	39	41	44
Overall	92	90	90	97	88	87	95	90

Overall, less than half of all beneficiaries were satisfied with NGOs' interface with them and NGOs' responsiveness to their opinions, including less than half of all beneficiaries in the GC, JC, HS and ER intervention areas. Additional problems appear to have been encountered in the adequacy of service/commodity theme, particularly in SI and JC interventions.

**TABLE 43: REGION AND GENDER BY SATISFACTION**

	T	West Bank		Gaza Strip		Male		Female	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Not satisfied at all	8	4	2%	4	0%	7	1%	1	0%
Not satisfied	25	10	5%	15	2%	11	2%	14	3%
Satisfied to an extent	144	19	10%	125	14%	67	12%	77	14%
Satisfied	643	75	38%	568	63%	301	54%	342	63%
Highly satisfied	276	85	43%	191	21%	169	30%	107	20%
No answer	6	4	2%	2	0%	1	0%	5	1%
Total	1102	197	100%	905	100%	556	100%	546	100%

63% of female beneficiaries were satisfied with the service, compared with 54% of male beneficiaries. 84% of male beneficiaries were satisfied or highly satisfied, compared with 83% of female beneficiaries. Rates of satisfaction between the West Bank and Gaza are also similar – 81% of West Bank beneficiaries and 84% of female beneficiaries are satisfied or highly satisfied.

**TABLE 44: SATISFACTION BY PROJECTS WITH MORE THAN 100 BENEFICIARIES**

	Project	Timeliness of project / service		Timeliness of service / commodity delivery		Method of service / commodity delivery		Method of commodity distribution		Suitability of service / commodity		Adequacy of service / commodity		Physical state of commodity		NGO's responsiveness to beneficiary's opinions		NGO interface with beneficiary		Overall Satisfaction	
		No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
JC	201GN02	2%	98%	4%	96%	4%	96%	4%	96%	13%	87%	19%	81%	5%	95%	2%	98%	3%	97%	3%	97%
HS	221GN03I	5%	95%	7%	93%	7%	93%	9%	91%	11%	89%	35%	65%	10%	90%	18%	82%	18%	82%	3%	97%

In JC project 201GN02 (Gaza / Job Creation, 120 beneficiaries) and HS project 221GN03I (North Gaza / Street Repair, 175 beneficiaries), sampled beneficiaries were least satisfied with the adequacy of the service or commodity while, in the latter project, 18% of beneficiaries were not satisfied with the NGO's responsiveness to their opinions. Overall, 97% of beneficiaries indicated that they were satisfied for both projects.

**In conclusion, overall rates of satisfaction were consistently higher than 80% for all projects, except project 272GN03 (GC / Jabalya / School repair: 25% not satisfied); and 001WS02 (HC / Bethlehem / Educational materials: 50% not satisfied).**

**Q: What factors, if any, led to beneficiaries being unsatisfied with the project?**

9% of beneficiaries indicated that factors existed that impacted their satisfaction with assistance (13% of West Bank beneficiaries and 8% of Gaza beneficiaries). Negative factors impacting satisfaction comprise:

- (1) Insufficient amount and length of assistance (73%);
- (2) Small wage, expensive goods, financial help insufficient (44%);
- (3) Poor maintenance, equipment broke down (39%);
- (4) Poor service after delivery and construction (35%);
- (5) Poor quality of goods and services (29%);
- (6) Assistance is out of context, no needs, and failed to help (13%);
- (7) Favoritism in the selection of beneficiaries and workers (5%); and
- (8) Poor communications with beneficiaries, institutions (3%).

Unsatisfied GC beneficiaries cited the following reasons for their lack of satisfaction:

- (1) Poor maintenance, equipment broken down;
- (2) Poor service after delivery and construction; and
- (3) Assistance out of context and failed to help

Unsatisfied SI beneficiaries cited that their satisfaction was impeded by insufficient amount and length of assistance, and insufficient financial help, as did JC and HS beneficiaries. 75% of beneficiaries indicated that the main impendent to their satisfaction was the continuation of the conflict.

	GC			SI				JC	YS	HC	HS			ER
TABLE 45: REASONS FOR NON-SATISFACTION	001GS02	230GN03I	272GN03	012WN02	101GN02	172GN02I	209GN03I	201GN02	101GS04	001WS02	110GN02	170WN04	221GN03I	090GS04
Insufficient amount and length of assistance	Y			Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	
Poor service after delivery and construction	Y			Y		Y							Y	Y
Poor maintenance, equipment broke down	Y										Y	Y		
Poor quality of goods and services	Y	Y				Y		Y		Y			Y	Y
Poor communications with beneficiaries, institutions											Y		Y	
Favoritism in the selection of beneficiaries and workers							Y						Y	
Assistance is out of context, no needs, and failed to help	Y		Y							Y	Y			
Small wage, expensive goods, financial help insufficient				Y								Y		

The preceding table details problems that impacted beneficiaries' satisfaction per project.

From the 24% of beneficiaries who indicated that they had received additional services to Rafeed from other providers, 7.5% indicated that they were more satisfied with the Rafeed service; 3.5% indicated that they were equally satisfied with services provided by Rafeed and other providers; 6% were much more satisfied with Rafeed; 2% were more satisfied with other providers than Rafeed; and 5% could not draw comparisons.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### Q: What recommendations do beneficiaries have for Rafeed's future work?

TABLE 46: BENEFICIARY RECOMMENDATIONS	Male	Female	Total	
	#	#	#	%
Jobs and income generating projects, supporting unemployed	172	93	265	13%
Public infrastructure and construction	162	174	336	17%
Commodities, food, clothes, stationary	25	54	79	4%
Agriculture, pools, re-planting, agro materials and equipment	134	5	139	7%
Health, medical treatment, public sanitation, pest control	16	18	34	2%
Home repairs and infrastructure, furniture, refurbish homes	5	22	27	1%
Youth, children and education services	45	103	148	8%
Youth support, sports and culture, trips and outings	10	64	74	4%
Special needs groups: elderly, disabled, handicapped	1	5	6	0%
Programmatic and management recommendations	466	375	841	43%
Projects for employment of women	11	12	23	1%
Total	1047	925	1972	100%

The majority of recommendations (43%) that were provided by beneficiaries (both male and female) focused upon programmatic and management changes to Rafeed's projects. These included:

- Widen the scope and volume of services and projects;
- Improve monitoring systems;
- Drop the Anti-Terrorism Certificate;
- Improve beneficiary selection process
- Make contractual agreements with Rafeed easier;
- Support not only NGOs projects, but also local councils;
- Pre-inform beneficiaries of projects;
- Integrate beneficiaries into project planning;
- Fund projects for individuals; and
- Improve screening and selection of implementing NGOs.

Remainder of recommendations (57%) were more concerned with the type of service or assistance delivered by Rafeed, including public infrastructure and construction (17% of all recommendations) and jobs and income generating projects (13%) as the second and third largest category of recommendations respectively.

TABLE 47: BENEFICIARIES' RECOMMENDATIONS BY INTERVENTION	GC	SI	JC	YS	HA	HS	ER	Total	
	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	%
Jobs and income generating projects, supporting unemployed	7	11	118	10	28	73	18	265	13%
Public infrastructure and construction	102	14	11	4	10	146	49	336	17%
Commodities, food, clothes, stationary	1	1	1	9	35		32	79	4%
Agriculture, pools, re-planting, agro materials and equipment	2	13			1	123		139	7%
Health, medical treatment, public sanitation, pest control	1				7	21	5	34	2%
Home repairs and infrastructure, furniture, refurbish homes	2	10			1		14	27	1%
Youth, children and education services	14	24	1	38	17	54		148	6%
Youth support, sports and culture, trips and outings	1	1		65	5	1	1	74	4%
Special needs groups: elderly, disabled, handicapped					6			6	1%
Programmatic and management recommendations	96	95	113	75	106	282	74	841	42%
Projects for employment of women	9	12			1		1	23	1%
No answer	6	5	2		5	19	1	38	2%
Total	241	186	246	201	222	719	195	2010	100%

Programmatic and management recommendations were the most frequent recommendations across all intervention areas, except for:

- GC beneficiaries, the majority of whom identified public infrastructure and construction; and
- JC beneficiaries, the majority of whom identified jobs and income generating projects.

## *FINDINGS OF INTERVIEWS WITH NGO PERSONNEL*

NGO personnel who were interviewed worked in organizations that were active in:

- Children, women, youth, student activities, special group;
- Job creation and emergency response;
- Culture, and development;
- Health care;
- Small business;
- Agriculture; and
- Public infrastructure.

NGO personnel cited the following justifications for implementing the projects that were funded by Rafeed that complemented the information provided by beneficiaries:

- Israeli actions, practice and invasions;
- The need for clean water, maintenance for agricultural pools;
- Improved public services and environment;
- Psychological problems with children;
- Risks and dangerous public places and roads;
- Creating job opportunities and improving economic situations;
- Houses did not meet minimum appropriate living conditions; and

Overall, NGO personnel believed that the Rafeed projects were timely, effective and well targeted. 90% of interviewed personnel characterized beneficiaries' situation as urgent at the time of providing the assistance from the Rafeed-funded project; 90% confirmed that the Rafeed-funded project succeeded in helping beneficiaries cope with their situations at that time; and 95% of NGO personnel agreed that the commodities and services reached the people who needed them the most at the time of delivery.

Only 60% believed that the amount of assistance was adequate given beneficiaries' needs. 10% agreed that operational constraints did limit their ability to successfully implement the project.

Half the NGO personnel interviewed indicated that beneficiaries were involved in planning and designing the Rafeed-funded project – 70% of those identified workshops as the method through which beneficiaries were involved; 65% identified public gatherings; 90% identified small group discussions and 40% identified documentation review. This directly contradicts the data findings based on an analysis of beneficiaries' perspective. It may be the case that the NGO is 'exaggerating' the extent to which beneficiaries were integrated in the planning and needs identification phase for Rafeed-funded projects.

The majority of NGO personnel agreed that Rafeed's proposal appraisal and project selection system was based on clear and transparent criteria. 30% agreed that prior knowledge of USAID regulations assisted them in designing the project; a similar proportion disapproved of the need to sign anti-terrorism certification.

<b>TABLE 48: PERCEPTIONS OF RAFEED'S OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS</b>	<b>Not Efficient</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Efficient</b>
Response mechanism to emergency situations	0%	30%	70%
Project identification process	0%	25%	75%
Project proposal processing time	4%	48%	48%
Procurement regulations and processes	0%	30%	70%
Project reporting requirements	0%	25%	75%

All NGO personnel interviewed believed that Rafeed was a good response mechanism for emergency situations – 70% of the NGO personnel described it as efficient. Overall, the NGO personnel were positive about all Rafeed's working systems – except for project proposal processing time, which 4% ranked as inefficient.

<b>TABLE 49: COMPARISON OF RAFEED'S WORKING SYSTEMS WITH OTHER DONORS</b>	<b>Worse</b>		<b>Same</b>		<b>Better</b>		<b>Much Better</b>		<b>No Answer</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Response mechanism to emergency situations			7	28	12	48	6	24		
Project identification process			9	36	8	32	7	28	1	4
Project proposal processing time	3	12	7	28	10	40	5	20		
Procurement regulations and processes			11	44	8	32	5	20	1	4
Project reporting requirements			7	28	10	40	7	28	1	4

72% of NGO personnel rated Rafeed as a better response mechanism than other donors. In generally, NGOs preferred all of Rafeed's working systems to those of other donors.

All NGO personnel were of the opinion that beneficiaries were aware of, or made to be aware of, Rafeed's existence at the time of the project. All NGO personnel knew that that USAID was funding Rafeed.

<b>TABLE 50: WORKING WITH RAFEED AND NGO CAPACITY</b>						
<b>Working with Rafeed resulted in the build-up of organizational capacity in:</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree to extent</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Totally agree</b>	<b>No answer</b>
Proposal Writing and Fundraising	4.0%	12.0%	24.0%	40.0%	12.0%	8.0%
Physical Record Keeping	4.0%	20.0%	16.0%	44.0%	12.0%	4.0%
Needs Assessments and Identifications	4.0%	24.0%	16.0%	28.0%	24.0%	4.0%
Beneficiary Selection	8.0%	12.0%	16.0%	20.0%	36.0%	8.0%
Report Writing	8.0%	16.0%	12.0%	12.0%	44.0%	8.0%
Financial Reporting	8.0%	16.0%	12.0%	12.0%	44.0%	8.0%
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	4.0%	20.0%	8.0%	32.0%	32.0%	4.0%
Knowledge of USAID / USG grant mechanisms		20.0%	28.0%	16.0%	36.0%	

Even though capacity building was not part of Rafeed's mandate, most NGO personnel agreed that working with Rafeed resulted in the build-up of organizational capacity. 60% acknowledged that special forms and procedures were developed specifically for working and reporting on the Rafeed-funded project.

<b>TABLE 51: NGO PERSONNEL - RECOMMENDED PROGRAMMATIC ISSUES</b>	<b>%</b>
Increase project length and budget	80
Simplify procedures and relax funding conditions	50
Rafeed to communicate directly with beneficiaries in assessing their needs	20
Improved oversight and follow-up by Rafeed	20
More direct and formal capacity building and training for recipient NGOs	20
Drop the Anti-Terrorism Certificate	5

The most frequent recommendation on programmatic issues centered on the adequacy of assistance: 80% of NGO personnel felt that the projects should be longer and have a larger budget. A significant number also recommended that procedures be simplified and funding conditions relaxed.

<b>TABLE 52: NGO PERSONNEL - RECOMMENDED PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS</b>	<b>%</b>
Projects in areas hard-hit by conflict and refugee camps	20
More for youth, women, children, and disabled (disadvantaged groups)	10
Infrastructure projects	10
Job creation projects	10
Agricultural projects	10

Suggestions for new projects and programs followed the existing Rafeed model: projects targeting Palestinians impacted by the conflict were the most commonly recommended. The similarity of the recommended projects to Rafeed's mandate and existing projects and the low number rate of recommendations can be interpreted to mean that the NGOs were satisfied with Rafeed's project selections.

## FINDINGS OF INTERVIEWS WITH KEY INFORMANTS

57% of interviewed key informants were involved in planning, designing, and/or implementing the project with NGO or Rafeed; 43% were not.

TABLE 53: EXTENT OF URGENCY AT TIME OF ASSISTANCE				
Not urgent at all	Not urgent	Urgent to a certain extent	Urgent	Very urgent
1%	2%	6%	19%	72%

Key informants believed that Rafeed fulfilled its mission by identifying and meeting highly urgent needs. 97% of key informants described the situation of Rafeed beneficiaries as urgent: 72% described it as “very urgent.” 98% of interviewed key informants agreed that the projects met urgent needs for communities as a whole. And 97% believed that the projects helped the beneficiaries to cope.

TABLE 54: EXTENT TO WHICH PROJECT HELPED BENEFICIARIES COPE				
Not helpful at all	Not helpful	Helpful to a certain extent	Helpful	Very helpful
0	3	9	17	70

Overall, key informants indicated that Rafeed projects were well targeted, timely, and relevant. 94% agreed that the assistance reached those who needed it the most; 92% agreed that the assistance reached beneficiaries when they needed it the most; and 89% agreed that the assistance was directly relevant to beneficiaries' humanitarian needs. However, 62% felt that the amount of assistance provided to beneficiaries was insufficient.

20% indicated that operational constraints limited the ability of the NGO in efficiently implementing the project. Such constraints included:

- Israeli practices;
- Beneficiary not awareness of the project; and
- Inappropriate project location.

In addition, 5% indicated that operational constraints limited the project's ability to assist needy beneficiaries due to the existence of such constraints.

Key informants provided the following programmatic recommendations:

- Increased project duration and scope;
- Better monitoring of NGOs; and
- Deliver capacity-building assistance directly to NGOs.

Key informants recommended more of the following types of projects:

- Physical rehabilitation programs;
- Public infrastructure;
- Job creation programs; and
- Agricultural projects.

TABLE 55: EXTENT OF KEY INFORMANTS' SATISFACTION WITH THE PROJECT				
Not satisfied at all	Not satisfied	Satisfied to a certain extent	Satisfied	Highly satisfied
1	3	15	28	52

96% of key informants were satisfied with the Rafeed project, citing the following reasons:

- Results of project sustainable in long-run;
- Assistance provided specifically to those with high levels of psychological stress;
- Protection extended to children;
- Agricultural projects supported; and
- Communities better organized as a result of project.

The key informants who were not satisfied (0.4%) cited the following reasons:

- Project's results were not sustainable in long-run; and
- Intended beneficiaries never benefited from project.

# ANNEX A: BENEFICIARY QUESTIONNAIRE



ألفا العالمية  
للأبحاث والمعلوماتية واستطلاعات الرأي



## BENEFICIARIES QUESTIONNAIRE

This study aims to evaluate the Rafeed financed projects beneficiaries satisfaction for future improvements. It is jointly conducted by Alpha and Massar for Rafeed. It is designed to collect the feedback of all direct and indirect beneficiaries. All Collected information will remain enclosed to Alpha and Massar, and will not be disclosed to any party. Finally, we would like to thank you very much for your cooperation.

FIELD WORK	
	QUESTIONNAIRE NUMBER (FOR OFFICE USE ONLY)
<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> RESIDENTIAL AREA OR LOCATION NAME .....
<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	RESEARCHER NAME: .....
..... / .... /2005	DATE OF INTERVIEW: ..... / .... /2005

FIELD FOLLOW UP	
<div>..... / .... /2005</div>	<div>DATE OF QUESTIONNAIRE REVISION BY RESEARCHER</div> <div>...../...../.....</div>
<div>..... / .... /2005</div>	<div>DATE OF QUESTIONNAIRE REVISION BY THE FIELD</div> <div>SUPERVISOR ...../...../.....</div>
	<div>SUPERVISOR NAME: .....</div> <div>SIGNATURE: .....</div>
<div> <input type="checkbox"/> </div>	<div>QUESTIONNAIRE STATUS:    1. COMPLETED            2. NOT</div> <div>COMPLETED</div> <div>REASON: .....</div>
OFFICE REVIEW	
	<div>REVIEWER NAME:</div>
<div> <input type="checkbox"/> <div>..... / ..... /2005</div> </div>	<div>DATE OF QUESTIONNAIRE REVIEW: ...../...../2005</div>
	<div>SUPERVISOR NAME: .....</div> <div>SIGNATURE: .....</div>

Rafeed Project	
<b>Q1: Please provide details on the type of emergency or humanitarian assistance that you received (Interviewer: Through the Project Financed by Rafeed) :</b>	
<b>Q1_1: What is the service provided? .....</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q1_2: Type of Commodity / Service</b> 1. General Use Constructions    2. Small Infrastructure projects 3. Create Job Opportunities    4. Youth Support    5. Humanitarian Assistance 6. Humanitarian Services    7. Help with Urgent Needs	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q1_3: Quantity? .....</b>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
<b>Q1_4: Unit?: .....</b>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
<b>Q1_5: Date (Month + Year)</b> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> / <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> / <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
<b>Q1_6: Provider (NGO): .....</b>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
<b>Q1_7: Funding Organization or Program (e.g. Rafeed): .....</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q1_8: Donor agency (e.g. USAID): .....</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q1_9: Context for receiving assistance (More than 1 answer can be chosen):</b> 1. Israeli Fence, Land Confiscation 2. Closure, Siege, Curfew 3. Military Activities 4. Expelled out of their homes 5. Private property destroyed / damaged 6. Public institutions destroyed / damaged 7. Shortage of Basic Life-sustaining goods (food) 8. Non existence/ Shortage of basic public services 9. Poverty 10. Temporary Unemployment 11. Continuous Unemployment ( Exceeds 6 months) 12. Other, please specify.....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q1_10: What is the Main context for receiving assistance?</b> 1. Israeli Fence, Land Confiscation 2. Closure, Siege, Curfew 3. Military Activities 4. Expelled out of their homes 5. Private property destroyed / damaged 6. Public institutions destroyed / damaged 7. Shortage of Basic Life-sustaining goods (food) 8. Non existence/ Shortage of basic public services 9. Poverty 10. Temporary Unemployment 11. Continuous Unemployment ( Exceeds 6 months) 12. Other, please specify.....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

Other Projects during 2002 – Present (Other than the mentioned above)	
<b>Q2: First Project (NOT RAFEED)</b>	
<b>Q2_1: Service Provided:</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q2_2: Type of Commodity / Service</b> 1. General Use Constructions    2. Small Infrastructure projects 3. Create Job Opportunities    4. Youth Support    5. Humanitarian Assistance 6. Humanitarian Services    7. Help with Urgent Needs	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q2_3: Quantity?</b> .....	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
<b>Q2_4: Unit?</b> .....	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
<b>Q2_5: Date (Month + Year)</b> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> / <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> / <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
<b>Q2_6 Service Provider :</b> .....	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
<b>Q2_7: Funding Organization or Program (e.g. Rafeed):</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q2_8: Donor agency (e.g. USAID):</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q2_9: Context for receiving assistance (More than 1 answer can be chosen):</b> 1. Israeli Fence, Land Confiscation 2. Closure, Siege, Curfew 3. Military Activities 4. Expelled out of their homes 5. Private property destroyed / damaged 6. Public institutions destroyed / damaged 7. Shortage of Basic Life-sustaining goods (food) 8. Non existence/ Shortage of basic public services 9. Poverty 10. Temporary Unemployment 11. Continuous Unemployment ( Exceeds 6 months) 12. Other, please specify.....	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
<b>Q2_10 What is the Main context for receiving assistance?</b> 1. Israeli Fence, Land Confiscation 2. Closure, Siege, Curfew 3. Military Activities 4. Expelled out of their homes 5. Private property destroyed / damaged 6. Public institutions destroyed / damaged 7. Shortage of Basic Life-sustaining goods (food) 8. Non existence/ Shortage of basic public services 9. Poverty 10. Temporary Unemployment 11. Continuous Unemployment ( Exceeds 6 months) 12. Other, please specify.....	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>

Q3: Second Project (NOT RAFEED)	
Q3_1: Service Provided: .....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q3_2: Type of Commodity / Service</b> 1. General Use Constructions    2. Small Infrastructure projects 3. Create Job Opportunities    4. Youth Support    5. Humanitarian Assistance 6. Humanitarian Services    7. Help with Urgent Needs	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q3_3: Quantity? .....	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
Q3_4: Unit? .....	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
Q3_5: Date (Month + Year) <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> / <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> / <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
Q3_6: Provider (NGO): .....	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
Q3_7: Funding Organization or Program (e.g. Rafeed):.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q3_8: : Donor agency (e.g. USAID): .....	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
<b>Q3_9: Context for receiving assistance (More than 1 answer can be chosen):</b> 12. Israeli Fence, Land Confiscation 13. Closure, Siege, Curfew 14. Military Activities 15. Expelled out of their homes 16. Private property destroyed / damaged 17. Public institutions destroyed / damaged 18. Shortage of Basic Life-sustaining goods (food) 19. Non existence/ Shortage of basic public services 20. Poverty 21. Temporary Unemployment 22. Continuous Unemployment ( Exceeds 6 months) 12. Other, please specify.....	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
<b>Q3_10 What is the Main context for receiving assistance?</b> 1. Israeli Fence, Land Confiscation 2. Closure, Siege, Curfew 3. Military Activities 4. Expelled out of their homes 5. Private property destroyed / damaged 6. Public institutions destroyed / damaged 7. Shortage of Basic Life-sustaining goods (food) 8. Non existence/ Shortage of basic public services 9. Poverty 10. Temporary Unemployment 11. Continuous Unemployment ( Exceeds 6 months) 12. Other, please specify.....	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
<b>INTERVIEWER – MAKE IT EXPLICIT THAT SURVEY IS FOR ASSISTANCE RECEIVED THROUGH RAFEED-FINANCED PROJECT, AND LINK THESE QUESTIONS WITH Q1_10</b>	

<b>Q3_A: To what extent was the situation considered to be URGENT at the time of providing the assistance from Rafeed-funded project?</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>		
6. No Answer	5. Not Urgent at all	4. Not Urgent	3. Urgent to a Certain Extent	2. Urgent	1. Very Urgent
<b>Q4: Was the emergency / humanitarian situation that you found yourself in, a result of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict?</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>Q5: How did the emergency situation impact you/ your family/the neighborhood? (The main extent mentioned in Q1_10)</b>					
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q5_1: Private property destroyed / damaged</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q5_2: Neighborhood / community infrastructure destroyed / damaged</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q5_3: Lack of mobility – under siege / curfew and could not leave</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q5_4: Lack of accessibility – assistance could not reach me</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q5_5: Injuries / fatal accidents to relatives, friends, family</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q5_6: Psychological stress</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q5_7: Eviction</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q5_8: Shortage of Basic Life-sustaining goods (food)</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q5_9: Lack of jobs – long term unemployment</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q5_10: Lack of access to basic services (Education, Health, Electricity, Water, Transportation)</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q5_11: Cannot access job, or services</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q5_12: High cost of goods and services</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q5_13: Shortage of Basic Life-sustaining goods (medicine)</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Q5_14: Other, specify .....</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>Q6: Identify your three most urgent humanitarian needs at the time of the Rafeed-funded project, starting with the most important need:</b>					
<b>Q6_1: (First Need): .....</b>			<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>Q6_2: (Second Need): .....</b>			<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>Q6_3: (Third Need): .....</b>			<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>Q7: To what extent did the commodity / service provided by the project helped you cope with the situation you found yourself in?</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>		

6. No Answer	5. Not Helpful at all	4. Not Helpful	3. Helpful to a Certain Extent	2. Helpful	1. Very Helpful	
<b>Q8: How did the assistance help you cope with the situation you were in at the time it was delivered?</b>						<input type="checkbox"/>
.....						<input type="checkbox"/>
.....						<input type="checkbox"/>
.....						
<b>Q8_1: If not, why?</b>						<input type="checkbox"/>
.....						<input type="checkbox"/>
.....						<input type="checkbox"/>
.....						
<b>Q9: What would have happened to you / family/ Neighborhood if you did not receive this assistance?</b>						
<b>1. Worse Situation      2. No Change      3. Better Situation</b>						<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Explain why?</b>						<input type="checkbox"/>
.....						<input type="checkbox"/>
.....						
.....						
<b>Q10: What alternative types of assistance would have helped you cope with your situation at the time?</b>						<input type="checkbox"/>
.....						<input type="checkbox"/>
.....						<input type="checkbox"/>
.....						
<b>Q11: Identify your community's three most urgent humanitarian needs at the time of the Rafeed-funded project, starting from the most important need:</b>						
<b>Q11_1: (First Need):</b> .....						<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q11_2: (Second Need):</b> .....						<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q11_3: (Third Need):</b> .....						<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q12: Did the assistance provided in the Rafeed-funded project meet your community's most urgent humanitarian need at that time?   1. Yes (Go to Q13)      2. No      3. I don't know</b>						<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q12_1: If no, why?</b>						<input type="checkbox"/>
.....						<input type="checkbox"/>
.....						
.....						
<b>Q13: What alternative types of assistance would have met your community's most urgent humanitarian need at the time?</b>						
<b>Q13_1: ..... (Commodity/First Service)</b>						<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

Q13_2: ..... (Commodity/Second Service)	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Q13_3.....(Commodity/Third Service)	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Q13_4: .....(Commodity/Forth Service)	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Q13_5: ..... (Commodity/Fifth Service)	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q14: Did the Commodities/Services reach the people who were in most need of it at that time?</b> 1. Yes (Go to Q15)                      2. No                      3. I don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q14_1: If no, why?</b> ..... ..... ..... .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q15: How did you come to be registered on the NGO list that provides the assistance through this project? (Choose one answer )</b> 2. You approached the NGO                      1. The NGO approached you	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Other beneficiary recommended you                      3. Others approached the NGO on your behalf  6. Local persona recommended you                      5. Local institution recommended you 7. There was no need for Assistance 8. Other, specify.....	
<b>Q16: Did the NGO explain the beneficiary selection criteria?</b> 1. Yes                      2. No (Go to Q17)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q16_1: If yes, explain the criteria</b> ..... ..... ..... .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q17 Do you judge the beneficiary selection criteria as fair and transparent? If not, why?</b> 1. Yes (GO to Q18)                      2. No	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q17_1: If no, why?</b> ..... ..... .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q18: Were you involved in working with the NGO to plan and design the type and content of assistance that you received:</b> 1. Yes                      2. No, the NGO didn't ask me to be involved (Go to Q19) 3. No, the NGO asked me to be involved but I chose not to be involved (Go to Q19)	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Q18_1: If Yes, through:</b>			
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q18_1_1: Workshop</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q18_1_2: Public gathering</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q18_1_3: Small group discussion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q18_1_4: Visit by NGO to your home or community</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q18_1_4: Other:.....</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q19: Were you satisfied with your participation in the project (Execution, design, planning)?</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>
1. Yes (Go to Q20) 2. No			
<b>Q19_1: If no, why?</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>
.....			<input type="checkbox"/>
.....			<input type="checkbox"/>
.....			
<b>Q20: Were there any problems / constraints affecting the delivery of the services/commodities provided from the project?</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>
1. Yes 2. No (Go to Q21)			
<b>Q20_1: If Yes, what were the problems/constraints?</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>
.....			<input type="checkbox"/>
.....			<input type="checkbox"/>
.....			
<b>Q21: Did the NGO assist you in solving the problems affecting the delivery of the services/commodities provided from the project?</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>
1. Yes 2. No			
<b>Q21_1: Explain?</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>
.....			<input type="checkbox"/>
.....			<input type="checkbox"/>
.....			
<b>Q22: At the time of receiving the commodity or service, do you think that the project:</b>			
<b>Q22_1 Helped others with similar needs and condition to yourself?</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>
1. Yes 2. No 3. I don't know (Go to Q22_2)			
<b>Q22_1_1: Explain?</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>
.....			<input type="checkbox"/>
.....			<input type="checkbox"/>
.....			
<b>Q22_2: Helped others with more acute needs than yourself?</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>
1. Yes 2. No 3. I don't know (Go to Q23)			
<b>Q22_2_1: Explain?</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>
.....			<input type="checkbox"/>

..... ..... .....						<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Q23: Overall, what problems did you encounter with this project (starting from the moment you knew about the assistance until you received it)?</b>							
Q23_1: (First Problem): .....						<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
Q23_2: (Second Problem): .....						<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
Q23_3: (Third Problem): .....						<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
Q23_4: (Forth Problem): .....						<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
Q23_5: (Fifth Problem): .....						<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Q24 Please rank your satisfaction on the Rafeed-funded project with the following statements:</b>							
No Answer	Highly Satisfied	Satisfied	Satisfied to an Extent	Not Satisfied	Not Satisfied at all	Item	
6	5	4	3	2	1	Q24_1:Timeliness of project( When you first knew about it)	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	5	4	3	2	1	Q24_2:Timeliness of service / commodity delivery	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	5	4	3	2	1	Q24_3:Method of service / commodity delivery	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	5	4	3	2	1	Q24_4:Method of commodity distribution	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	5	4	3	2	1	Q24_5:Suitability of service / commodity	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	5	4	3	2	1	Q24_6:Adequacy of service / commodity	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	5	4	3	2	1	Q24_7:Physical state of commodity	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	5	4	3	2	1	Q24_8:NGO's responsiveness to your opinions	<input type="checkbox"/>



Q28_2: .....	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q28_3: .....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Interviewee Background</b>	
ID0: Age:.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
ID1: Sex:                    1. Male                    2. Female	<input type="checkbox"/>
ID2: Permanent Accommodation Location: 1. Urban   2. Rural   3. Refugee camp   4. Bedouin	<input type="checkbox"/>
ID3: Governorate: .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
ID4 : Education ( Higher Degree Obtained) 1. Can't read and write    2. Can read and write    3. Primary school 4. Secondary school    5. High school    6. Diploma    7. Bachelor, and More	<input type="checkbox"/>
ID5: Social Status: 1. Single    2. Married    3. Divorced    4. Widow    5. Separated	<input type="checkbox"/>
ID6: Occupation: 1. Work, specify type of work:.....    2. Doesn't work	<input type="checkbox"/>
ID7: Family Members Number: <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
ID7_1: Number Of individuals that contributes in the family monthly income <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
ID7_2: Number of family individuals aged between 15 and 64 years <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
ID8: Monthly Family Income <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
ID9: Household head: 1. Father   2. Mother   3. One of family male members 4. One of family female members    5. Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

# ANNEX B1: MATRIX OF KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS

CODE	TYPE	#	NAME	JOB TITLE
001GS02	GC	3	Dr. Abed Abdel Qader Siam	Manager of Health & Environmental Sector, Khan Yunis Municipality
			Dr. Mousa El Astal	Local committee leader of El Mahta
			Mohammad Nafez Abu Zeyara	Head of Al Amal Committees
032WS03	GC	2	Jamal Ali Tomazi	Mayor of Idna Municipality
			Abdulrohman Abdelhafiz Tomazi	Public Relations Manager – Idna Municipality
112WS03	GC	3	Ali A'mer A'mayrah	Head of Suba Village Council
			Engineer Fouad Al-A'mlah	Project Consultant
			Abdulrohman Abdelhafiz Tomazi	Public Relations Manager – Idna Municipality
178WN04	GC	2	Aref Ibrahim	Head of Anza Village Council
			Eng. Ibrahim Yassin	Site Engineer
230GN03I	GC	3	Sufean Hamad	The director of the Municipality (Beit Hanoun)
			Ibrahim Abu Hammad	Water networks Technician/ Beit Hanoun Municipality
			Eng. Ramadan Naeem	Municipality Eng
272GN03	GC	3	Halema Abu Morad	Headmaster of Beit Hanoun School for girls
			Fayza El Khaldi	Headmaster of Omar Ebn El Khatab School
			Kamal El Deen Abu A'ta	Headmaster of Abu Obada Ebn El Jarah school
003WN03	GC	5	Jasser Shukry Khalil	Al-Zabadeh Deputy Mayor
			Eng. Dawod Farah Shaheen	Municipality Engineer
			Mohammad Mahmoud Ahmad Bzour	Zababdeh Boys School Director
			Waleed Zakarneh	Head of Engineering Dept. in Qabatia Municipality
			Turkey Zakarneh	Engineer in Qabatia Municipality
201GN02	JC	3	Nabel Abu Ikmel	The municipality director. (Al Mughraqa)
			Suliman Al Sa'dne	The director of the Al Aqsa Club
			Muhammad Bnayat	Al Malalha's Mayor
101GS04	YS	3	Hiba Idwan	Disabled Families Society

CODE	TYPE	#	NAME	JOB TITLE
			Najwa Al Fara	Al Shoroq wa Al Amal Society
			Mona Sha'ath	Young Scientist Society
249GN04	YS	3	An'am Heles	Zakher Association Chiarmen
			Numan Abu Shamla	Deir el Balah for Child Development Assoc
			Mohammad Abu Rabea'	World University Services
011gs02	YS	3	Dr. Neman Elwan	University Professor - Al Aqsa University
			Najwa El Gharra	Manager _Al Shorouq & El Amal Clup
			Yousra El Abadla	Manager-Woman & Child Society
209GN03I	SI	3	Sufean Hamad	The director of the Municipality (Beit Hanoun)
			Majdee Abu Amsha	Sweden Insitution for Individuall Relief
			Mohammad Al Amawy	Beit Hanoun Clinic
002WN02	SI	3	Ghanyah Aldonbok	Ministry of Social Affairs employee
			Jenan Albetar	Community Services' Center, Volunteer
			Raja Albawab	Social Supervisor
172GN02I	SI	3	Sufean Hamad	The director of the Municipality (Beit Hanoun)
			Eng. Ramdan Na'm	Engineering officer
			Eng. Mohamad Hani El Reba'	Engineer
088GS04	SI	3	Eng. Jom'a Al Hashash	PARC
			Nazmy Zo'rob	Farmers Committees
			Abdel Satar Soliman Sha'ath	Union of Farmers
012WN02	SI	4	Adnan Alsaify	Ex Head of Taal Village Council
			Sa'ed Awwad Abu Sameh)	Head of Awarta Village Council
			Mohammed Maarof Asayra	Assera Al Qiblieh Village Council Head
			Ursan Ibrahim Najjar	Head of Charity Associations Union / Head of Boreen Village Council
023GS02	SI	3	Ibraheem Abu Shehmah	Cummunity Committee Member / Maen
			Ali Ibraheem Saleh	School Headmaster
			Dr. Fares Abu Moa'mer	Commercial Faculty Dean
101GN02	SI	3	Zead al Msulami	Attorney-At-Law (Private)
			Dr. Mohammad Abu Halub	Al Shema' Society Director
			Suhel Ghaben	Municipal Member
088GS03	ER	2	Majeed Al-Agha	The Governor of Rafah
			Saleem Abu Taha	Project Coordinator – Rafah Governorate
089GS03	ER	2	Dr. Ali Barhoum	Director General of Rafah

CODE	TYPE	#	NAME	JOB TITLE
				Municipality
			Eng. Said Zuaroub	Head of Rafah Municipality
090GS04	ER	2	Darwesh Abu Sharekh	Al Amal Reh. Society
			Khaled Abu Afarneh	Yabous Association
001WS02	HC	1	Ibrahim Deriah	Head of Planning and Design – Ministry of Education – Bethlehem Directorate
002GS02	HC	3	Intisar Al-Bashity	Director of Atfal Al-Saada Kinder Garten
			Imad Shubeir	Director of Nouran Kinder Garten
			Zuhier Ahmad Barakah	Al Awdah Association
034WC04	HC	3	Fares Mohammad Nasser	Chairman of Deir Qaddis Village Council
			Mohammad Hassan Musleh	Village Councils' Coordinator for South Western Ramallah Area
			Taha Al Khawaja	Chairman of Na'alín Village Council
105GS04	HC	3	Amal Tabasi	Al Nahda Society/Rafah - Director
			Majdi Hamdan	Local Committee/ Khan Yunis
			Dr. Tareq Al Omour	Al Fukhari for Development and Culture
265GN04	HC	4	Adel Mahmoud Abu Zaied	Al Zakat Committee member (Bureij Camp)
			Dr. Ali Shehda Barhoum	Mayor of Rafah
			Saleem Hammad	Al Zakat Committee (Nusseirat
			Mahmood Al Nairab	Deputy Minister, Al Waqf Ministry
006GS02	HS	3	Abdullah Noh's El Nahhal	Member of Central Reforming Committee
			Amal Tabasi	Al Nahda Society/Rafah - Director
			Khalid Hargoun	Policeman at Rafah Crossing Point
221GN03I	HS	3	Sufean Hamad	The director of the Municipality (Beit Hanoun)
			Mamdouh El-Zaneen	Bait Hanoun Municipality
			Ramadan Naem	Engineer, Joint Service Council
170WN04	HS	3	Bassam Ghanem	Yabad Municipality Engineer
			Yousef Mahmoud Atatra	Yabad Municipality Manager
			Awney Adddeb Attaher	Ex. Municipal Member
110GN02	HS	4	Eng. Mazen Mershed	Engineering officer -MOE
			Eng. Mohammad Nezar Jarada	Manager of the engineering department -MOE
			Hana' El Khozandar	School Administrator
			Mohamed Awwad	Dean of Faculty of Engineering at Islamic Uni, Gaza
008GS02	HS	2	Adnan Sha'ath	School principal
			Saeed Abu Harb	Education Department (Rafah_ manager

# ANNEX B2: KEY INFORMANT QUESTION LISTS



ألفا العالمية  
للأبحاث والمعلوماتية واستطلاعات الرأي



## KEY INFORMANTS QUESTIONNAIRE

This study aims to evaluate opinions of local key informants about Rafeed financed projects, for future improvements. It is jointly conducted by Alpha and Massar for Rafeed. It is designed to collect the feedback of all direct and indirect beneficiaries. All Collected information will remain enclosed to Alpha and Massar, and will not be disclosed to any party. Finally, we would like to thank you very much for your cooperation.

FIELD WORK	
	QUESTIONNAIRE NUMBER (FOR OFFICE USE ONLY)
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div> <input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/> </div> <div> <input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/> </div> </div>	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div> <input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/> </div> <div> <b>RESIDENTIAL AREA OR LOCATION</b>   <b>NAME</b> .....         </div> </div>
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div> <input type="text"/><input type="text"/> </div> <div> <b>RESEARCHER NAME:</b> .....         </div> </div>	
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div> ..... / ... /2005         </div> <div> <b>DATE OF INTERVIEW:</b> ..... / ... /2005         </div> </div>	
FIELD FOLLOW UP	
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div> ..... / ... /2005         </div> <div> <b>DATE OF QUESTIONNAIRE REVISION BY</b>   <b>RESEARCHER</b> ...../...../.....         </div> </div>	

<p>..... / .... /2005</p>	<p><b>DATE OF QUESTIONNAIRE REVISION BY THE FIELD</b></p> <p><b>SUPERVISOR</b> ...../...../.....</p>
	<p><b>SUPERVISOR NAME:</b> .....</p> <p><b>SIGNATURE:</b> .....</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><b>QUESTIONNAIRE STATUS:</b>    <b>1. COMPLETED</b></p> <p><b>2. NOT COMPLETED</b></p> <p><b>REASON:</b></p> <p>.....</p>
<p><b>OFFICE REVIEW</b></p>	
	<p><b>REVIEWER NAME:</b></p>
<p>..... / ..... /2005</p>	<p><b>DATE OF QUESTIONNAIRE REVIEW:</b> ...../...../2005</p>
	<p><b>SUPERVISOR NAME:</b> .....</p> <p><b>SIGNATURE:</b> .....</p>







# ANNEX C1: MATRIX OF NGO PERSONNEL INTERVIEWS

CODE	TYPE	NGO NAME	NGO INTERVIEWEE NAME
001GS02	GC	The Free Thinking and Culture Association	Murad Abu Dagga / Mariam Zakout
032WS03	GC	Idna Welfare Society for Higher Education	Yousif Abdel Hamid AL Tomaizi
112WS03	GC	Idna Charitable Society	Abdel Fatah Tomaizi
178WN04	GC	Rafeed / Al Abbasy Company	Zaher Ahmad Hmaidat
230GN03I	GC	The Palestinian Environmental Friends Association	Eng. Tayseer AL Jazar + Dr. Samir Al Afifi
272GN03	GC	Association of Educational Enrichment and Creative Thinking	Essam Fahmi Al Masri
003WN03	GC	Arab Center for Agricultural Development	Mahmod Al A'tary
209GN03I	SI	Jabalia Rehabilitation Society	Husien Abu Mansour
002WN02	SI	Community Services Center, Al Najah University	Mr. Sami Al Kilani
172GN02I	SI	Association of Engineers - Northern Gaza Branch	Eng. Nafez Kahlout
088GS04	SI	Greenhouses Farmers' Society	Ashraf Abdel Kareem Al Astal
012WN02	SI	Palestinian Hydrology Group	Sami Dawd
023GS02	SI	Development and Improvement Environment Society (DIE)	Suliman Saleh El Ghalban
101GN02	SI	Beit Lahiya Development Association (BLDA)	Sefian Mohamed Rajab
088GS03	ER	Al-Amal Rehabilitation Society for the Disabled	Dr. Darwish Abu Sharikh
089GS03	ER	Al-Amal Rehabilitation Society for the Disabled	Dr. Darwish Abu Sharikh
090GS04	ER	Al-Awdah Charitable Association	Dr. Zuheir Baraka
001WS02	HC	Annour Youth Institution	Mr. Wael Al Zaboun
002GS02	HC	El Hanan Benevolent Assoc. for Mother & Child	Dr. Aminh Zaqqout
034WC04	HC	Association of Women Committees for Social Work (AWCSW)	Saleem Dabour
105GS04	HC	Al-Awdah Charitable Association	Dr. Zohair Ahmed Barakeh
265GN04	HC	Nour El Ma'rifa Charitable Society	Abdel Jaleel Abdel Hamid Gorab + Mohammed Gorab
006GS02	HS	Bunat Al-Mustaqbal Association	Kamilia Saeed Al Nahal
221GN03I	HS	PCHRD Company for Human Resource Development	Dr. Hassan Ali Abu Jarad
170WN04	HS	Rafeed / Al Mawke' Group for digging Water Wells	Eng. Jamil Saleh Elhaj Yousif
110GN02	HS	Community Service & Continuing Education Center (CSCEC) - The Islamic University in Gaza	Ziad Abu Hale
008GS02	HS	Palestinian Environmental Friends Association	Eng. Tayseer Abu Khazendar
201GN02	JC	Green Peace Society	Ahammad Brghoth
101GS04	YS	Bunian Association for Training, Evaluation and Community Studies	Mr. Bassam Jouda
249GN04	YS	PCHRD Company for Human Resource Development	Dr. Hassan Abu jarad
011gs02	YS	Bunian Association for Training, Evaluation and	Mr. Bassam Jouda

CODE	TYPE	NGO NAME	NGO INTERVIEWEE NAME
		Community Studies	
			TOTAL

# ANNEX C2: NGO PERSONNEL QUESTION LISTS

## NGOS QUESTIONNAIRE

This study aims to evaluate opinions of the NGOs executing the Rafeed financed projects, for future improvements. It is jointly conducted by Alpha and Massar for Rafeed. It is designed to collect the feedback of all direct and indirect beneficiaries. All Collected information will remain enclosed to Alpha and Massar, and will not be disclosed to any party. Finally, we would like to thank you very much for your cooperation.

FIELD WORK	
	QUESTIONNAIRE NUMBER (FOR OFFICE USE ONLY)
<div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="margin-right: 20px;"> <input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/> </div> <div> <input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/> </div> </div>	<div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="margin-right: 20px;"> <input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/> </div> <div> <input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/> </div> </div>
	RESIDENTIAL AREA OR LOCATION
	NAME .....
<div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="margin-right: 20px;"> <input type="text"/><input type="text"/> </div> <div> <input type="text"/><input type="text"/> </div> </div>	RESEARCHER NAME: .....
..... / .... /2005	DATE OF INTERVIEW: ..... / .... /2005
FIELD FOLLOW UP	
..... / .... /2005	DATE OF QUESTIONNAIRE REVISION BY RESEARCHER ...../...../.....

<p>..... / .... /2005</p>	<p><b>DATE OF QUESTIONNAIRE REVISION BY THE FIELD</b></p> <p><b>SUPERVISOR</b> ...../...../.....</p>
	<p><b>SUPERVISOR NAME:</b> .....</p> <p><b>SIGNATURE:</b> .....</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><b>QUESTIONNAIRE STATUS:</b>    <b>1. COMPLETED</b>                      <b>2. NOT</b></p> <p><b>COMPLETED</b></p> <p><b>REASON:</b> .....</p>
<p><b>OFFICE REVIEW</b></p>	
	<p><b>REVIEWER NAME:</b></p>
<p>...../...../2005</p>	<p><b>DATE OF QUESTIONNAIRE REVIEW:</b> ...../...../2005</p>
	<p><b>SUPERVISOR NAME:</b> .....</p> <p><b>SIGNATURE:</b> .....</p>

<b>Q1: Please provide the following basic details about Rafeed-funded project(s) that your NGO has implemented:</b>	
<b>Q1: First Project</b>	
<b>Q1_1: Organization Name:</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q1_2: Name of person interviewed:</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q1_3: Job title of person interviewed:</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q1_3: Were you working at the organization at the time of the financed project of Rafeed?</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q1_4: Name of Project:</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q1_5: Number of projects done by your organization (In Coordination with and financed by Rafeed):</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q1_6: What needs and circumstances made you apply for this project?</b> ..... ..... .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q1_7: Explain those circumstances:</b> ..... ..... .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q2: How did you identify the needs that the Rafeed-funded project addressed?</b> ..... ..... ..... ..... ..... ..... .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Q3: Were beneficiaries involved in planning and designing the Rafeed-funded project?</b> 1. Yes                      2. No <b>(Go to Q4)</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q3_1: If yes, how were they involved?</b>			
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q3_1_1: Workshop</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q3_1_2: Public gathering</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q3_1_3 :Small group discussion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q3_1_4: Reviewing documentations</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q3_1_5: Other, please specify .....</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q4: Were beneficiaries involved in deciding what type and form of assistance was most appropriate?</b> 1. Yes                      2. No <b>(Go to Q5)</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q4_1: If yes, how were they involved?</b>			
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q4_1_1: Workshop</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q4_1_2: Public gathering</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q4_1_3: Small group discussion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. No	1. Yes	<b>Q4_1_4: Reviewing documentations</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q4_1_5: Other, please specify .....</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q5: Please rank your NGOs top-four priority program areas (starting from the most important):</b>			
<b>Q5_1: (First Priority): .....</b>			<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q5_2: (Second Priority): .....</b>			<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q5_3: (Third Priority): .....</b>			<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q5_4: (Fourth Priority): .....</b>			<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q6: Which geographical areas do you work in?</b>			<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
.....			
.....			
.....			
.....			

<b>Q7: Was Rafeed's selection process relating to your projects clear and transparent?</b> ..... ..... ..... .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q8: How was beneficiary selection criteria established for the Rafeed-funded project?</b> ..... ..... .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q9: What steps were taken by you to apply these selection criteria?</b> ..... ..... .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q10: To what extent was the situation URGENT at the time of providing the assistance from Rafeed-funded project?</b>  6. No Answer      5. Not Urgent at all      4. Not Urgent      3. Urgent to a Certain Extent      2. Urgent      1. Very Urgent	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q11: Identify the beneficiaries' three most urgent humanitarian needs at the time of the Rafeed-funded project (starting from the most important need)</b>	
<b>Q11_1: (First Need):</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q11_2: (Second Need):</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q11_3: (Third Need):</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q12: To what extent did the Rafeed-funded project helped beneficiaries cope with their situations at the time?</b>  6. No Answer      5. Not Helpful at all      4. Not Helpful      3. Helpful to a Certain Extent      2. Helpful      1. Very Helpful	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q13: Do you think that commodities and services reached the people who most needed at the time?</b> 1. Yes      2. No	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q13_1: If No, why?</b> ..... ..... ..... .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Q14: To the best of your knowledge:</b>	
<b>Q14_1: Did the assistance reach beneficiaries when they most needed it? 1. Yes      2. No</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q14_1_1: Explain?</b> ..... ..... ..... ..... ..... ...	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q14_2: Did the assistance go to the most needy? 1. Yes      2. No</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q14_2_1: Explain?</b> ..... ..... ..... .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q14_3: Was the type of assistance relevant to the needs of beneficiaries? 1. Yes      2. No</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q14_3_1: Explain?</b> ..... ..... ..... .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q14_4: Was the amount of assistance adequate for the needs of beneficiaries?</b> <b>1. Yes      2. No</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q14_4_1: Explain?</b> ..... ..... ..... .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q15: Did operational constraints limit your ability to successfully implement the project? 1. Yes      2. No (Go to Q16)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q15_1: If yes, what were these constraints?</b> ..... ..... ..... .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q16: Did you collaborate with beneficiaries to try to remove these constraints?</b> <b>1. Yes      2. No</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q16_1: If yes, how?</b> ..... ..... ..... .....	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Q17: Did USAID regulations influence the design of the Rafeed-funded project</b> 1. Yes                      2. No (Go to Q18)							<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q17_1: If yes, how?</b> ..... ..... ..... .....							<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q18: Please rank your view of Rafeed's:</b>							
3. Efficient    2. Satisfactory    1. Not Efficient			Q18_1: Response mechanism to emergency situations			<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Efficient    2. Satisfactory    1. Not Efficient			Q18_2: Project identification process			<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Efficient    2. Satisfactory    1. Not Efficient			Q18_3: Project proposal processing time			<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Efficient    2. Satisfactory    1. Not Efficient			Q18_4: Procurement regulations and processes			<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Efficient    2. Satisfactory    1. Not Efficient			Q18_5: Project reporting requirements			<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Q19: Were special forms and procedures developed by your organization specifically for working on the Rafeed project?</b> 1. Yes                      2. No							<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q19_1: If yes, please explain.</b> ..... ..... ..... .....							<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q20: Compared to other grant-makers, how would you rank Rafeed's:</b>							
No Answer	Much Better	Better	Same	Worse	Very Worse	Item	
6	5	4	3	2	1	Q20_1: Response mechanism to emergency situations	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	5	4	3	2	1	Q20_1: Project identification process	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	5	4	3	2	1	Q20_1: Project proposal processing time	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	5	4	3	2	1	Q20_1: Procurement regulations and processes	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	5	4	3	2	1	Q20_1: Project reporting requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q21: Were beneficiaries aware of Rafeed's existence at the time of the project?</b> 1. Yes                      2. No							<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q21_1: If no, why?</b> ..... ..... ..... .....							<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Q22: Did you know that USAID was providing the funding for the Rafeed-funded project? 1. Yes                      2. No (Go to Q23)</b>							<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q22_1: If no, why?</b> ..... ..... .....							<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q23: Please rank your agreement on the financed project from Rafeed from the following aspects:</b>							
No Answer	Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to a Certain Extent	Don't Agree	Working with Rafeed enhanced our NGO's skills in:	
6	5	4	3	2	1	<b>Q23_1: Proposal Writing and Fundraising</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	5	4	3	2	1	<b>Q23_2: Physical Record Keeping</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	5	4	3	2	1	<b>Q23_3: Needs Assessments and Identifications</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	5	4	3	2	1	<b>Q23_4: Beneficiary Selection</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	5	4	3	2	1	<b>Q23_5: Report Writing</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	5	4	3	2	1	<b>Q23_6: Financial Reporting</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	5	4	3	2	1	<b>Q23_7: Project Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	5	4	3	2	1	<b>Q23_8: Knowledge of USAID / USG grant mechanisms</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q24: Do you have any recommendations for Rafeed to improve its responses to emergency and humanitarian situations?</b>							
<b>Q24_1:</b> .....							<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q24_2:</b> .....							<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q24_3:</b> .....							<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q24_4:</b> .....							<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>



“With USAID funds, the Emergency Assistance Project (Rafeed) reached Palestinians who were in an ever-deepening crisis with no other support.

90% of all beneficiaries indicated that their situation would have worsened had Rafeed not intervened to assist them.”

## RESULTS OF THE BENEFICIARY SATISFACTION ASSESSMENT



AHMAD SAFI, ARD, INC.

**Workers repairing a house damaged by military activity in the northern Gaza Strip in 2003. USAID contracted ARD, Inc. to respond rapidly to the humanitarian needs of Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.**

**U.S. Agency for International Development**

1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20523

Tel: (202) 712-0000

Fax: (202) 216-3524

**[www.usaid.gov](http://www.usaid.gov)**